

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 16 September 2004

The **DEPUTY SPEAKER (Hon. R.B. Such)** took the chair at 10.30 a.m. and read prayers.

### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.  
(Continued from 15 September. Page 63.)

**Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson):** In making my remarks on the Address in Reply, I first place on the record my appreciation of the great work that the Governor, Her Excellency Marjorie Jackson-Nelson, does for South Australia. It does not matter where you go around the state, wherever our Governor has been you hear people say what a wonderful person she is, as well as a fantastic ambassador and representative for South Australia. I place on the public record my sincere appreciation for the excellent effort of our Governor. However, I cannot say that I want to place on the public record my congratulations on the excellent record of the Labor government because, quite frankly, it is anything but excellent. I have just come from a business breakfast this morning and, as I indicated in this house yesterday, slowly but surely people are starting to wake up to the facade of the plasticine Rann government. They are realising that, behind that facade, very little is happening, and we have been saying this for some time.

The Premier has a lot of good friends in the media and, being a journalist himself, focuses very much on getting his media stories across whenever possible and particularly likes to get the front page wherever he can. But, of course, we all know that you cannot judge a book by its cover and, in fact, it is the depth, content and message within the book that counts. What I am saying is that there is a lack of substance in this government and a lack of real action by this government. At the moment, South Australia certainly needs action. When you have been through a situation of hard times and you have rebuilt your state and had six or seven years of consecutive growth, there is always a danger that people will fall into a comfort zone and that a government will come in and think that an economy will continue to roll on without its actually being in the driver's seat. That is the concern that I have with this government.

Many people say to me things such as, 'Media Mike: that is actually right', or 'It is a government of all talk and no action,' or 'It is a government that talks the talk but doesn't walk the walk.' These are the sorts of messages starting to get out into the community of South Australia today. Let us look at some of the facts about employment. Why is South Australia faring worse than other states on the employment front? In recent times we have seen a slip away from the national average after working so hard following the State Bank debacle to bring about strong employment growth. It is disappointing, now being in opposition, to see those trends going the wrong way.

It was interesting to pick up the local paper last week and, again, see stories of southern residents unable to access proper health care at the Flinders Medical Centre. People in the Ambulance Service tell me that bypass is on the increase—that is, that people from my own area in the south cannot get into the Flinders Medical Centre and often have

to be taken past it to another hospital. There is also the issue of crime. On the weekend we saw another example of where this government does not have the right focus on crime where five incidents on buses in the southern suburbs occurred on just one night where rocks were being hurled at buses, and supervisors from the bus companies were being abused by these gangs that are running around making it unsafe for people to access our public transport. Sadly, when caught, and after jumping all over the supervisor's car, these young people got off with a caution. I would have preferred to see them end up at least having to do community service orders and actually scrub the buses to fix the graffiti and damage that they have done to our public transport.

When it comes to an holistic strategy for law and order, here is a classic example of the plasticine, facade-only Rann Labor government that says it is tough on law and order. Yet, we have problems all over the state when it comes to gangs—they are not groups but organised gangs, and they are out of control. Have a look at what has happened in the northern suburbs in recent times. In fact, only today on the radio I heard that a councillor from the Tea Tree Gully council was out there in shopping centres actively seeking signatures on a petition, because the Tea Tree Gully council has had a gutful of the inaction of this Rann Labor government. They offered to build a police station out there; they are desperately calling for extra police resources. The Holden Hill LSA is in diabolical trouble with police numbers and, in fact, on two occasions in recent times I have been advised—

*Ms Bedford interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Ms BEDFORD:** I rise on a point of order.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Before I take the point of order, the member for Florey was interjecting which, I remind her, is out of order.

**Ms BEDFORD:** I very humbly apologise, but the member may not realise that he is misleading the house. I think that he needs to be very careful with what he is saying about the police station.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member must make that statement by way of a substantive motion and not just make that allegation, if she believes a member is or has been misleading the house. It is not a point of order.

**Mr BROKENSHIRE:** I fail to see how you mislead the house when all you say is that the Holden Hill LSA has serious problems because it is short of police numbers. The member for Kavel knows all about it—a very hard-working member for his community. He happened to ring the Holden Hill LSA three times recently and three times the phone rang out, but it is not only happening to the member for Kavel. I wish to report to this house that I was advised by a constituent that they also rang the Holden Hill LSA and the phone rang out. Of course, we know that they are down 40 police officers and non-sworn officers on the establishment level numbers at the Holden Hill LSA. When we got some advice on this, we were told that they are down on numbers and they actually said that they would have to wait until they got officers out of the police academy before they could even get the number back to the base establishment level. They said in a document that they had to have 11 police constables graduate as probationary constables from the academy before they could even start to catch up on establishment levels. That says to me that they were not recruiting at attrition because, if they were recruiting at attrition, we would have seen those police officers going through as others were retiring instead

of the catch up game that this Rann government is constantly on about.

Even though we had documentation saying that 11 had to come from the academy to help backfill the lack of establishment numbers at Holden Hill, guess how many graduated who went to Holden Hill? Have a guess! Let me tell you—one! We have gone from 11 to 10—still 10 more to go to get back towards an establishment level, let alone getting the extra 200 police that the Police Association of South Australia, the Liberal opposition and the community of South Australia demanded that the Rann government deliver. I want to put on the public record—and it is important that the community understand this—that we see rewrite after rewrite from the Rann Labor government. I heard the police minister say recently that he always intended to put on extra police. That is not correct because, if you look at the public record, we spent 18 months in here arguing about police numbers and all we ever got from the government was that we recruited attrition. It was the public pressure that forced the 200 extra police, not the generosity of the Rann Labor government.

We saw the graph go up by the police minister during the estimates committee—which was a display in this house and he should have been brought into line for that—but he forgets to tell the South Australian community that the growth thus far in police numbers is directly as a result of the Liberal government budget and recruitment strategy. I have the fax on my desk in this parliament to prove that. He also forgets to tell the community that we were recruiting extra non-sworn officers to assist. This government has lost the plot on that as well and extra police who came through as a result of the Liberal government's recruitment program and flowed over into this Rann government have been put not out on the streets but behind the desk because, if you want to look at problems in the police budget, you can see them everywhere and one example of that is in the non-sworn area. If you speak to the administration officers in the LSAs they will tell you they are down on non-sworn numbers as well as sworn numbers. So, this is not a tough government on law and order. This government has a holistic strategy. Yesterday we heard the Attorney-General come in here and prattle on about the fact that he cannot be involved in directing when it comes to a breach of bail. Nobody has said that. I did not say that, nor did Rob Lawson.

*The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:*

**Mr BROKENSHERE:** The Attorney-General explained to the South Australian community why one person alone has had 12 breaches of bail and was still out there running and the Attorney-General now agrees. He is only in custody because of the profile raised by us in the media.

*The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The Attorney is out of order—he is the chief law officer and should set an example. The member for Mawson has the call.

**Mr BROKENSHERE:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker, for your protection. The Attorney-General now agrees that there was a serious concern there with this repeat offender. We all support bail, but offenders are laughing in the face of the police, habitually breaching bail and running around the CBD intimidating the community. People are ringing me saying, 'Robert, we need some help because we feel unsafe,' and the Attorney says that that is why they are doing something about it. The Attorney should have been on the phone to the relevant authorities.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** Who?

**Mr BROKENSHERE:** To the Police Commissioner and the DPP, asking them whether they could explain a situation where there is a continual breach of bail and whether they are investigating that continual breach of bail. The Bail Act clearly says that if you breach your bail there are penalties of up to two years' imprisonment or a \$10 000 fine. When this person breached bail and went back to court he got a \$10 fine and a good behaviour bond and was told, 'See you later mate, go out and breach your bail again, get into the amphetamines again.' No opportunity was offered for drug diversion and rehabilitation. He was able to get out and intimidate those day-care workers and volunteers in the day centres. The nurses who are—

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** Who said that?

**Mr BROKENSHERE:** That is obviously the message this guy was getting, because he could walk in and out of the courts, day in and day out, and just breach bail.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** Who said that?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order, the Attorney-General!

**Mr BROKENSHERE:** With my colleagues, I will spend the next 19 months, day in and day out, telling the people the facts on how soft this government is and of the lack of proper structure of this Rann Labor government on law and order. In fact, people everywhere are waking up to that fact.

I want to speak about a few other issues, such as the problems facing us in relation to the care of the Public Service under the Rann Labor government. When I first came into this house, I did not really understand the Public Service, because I was a farmer and a business person, and I saw the Public Service and the government as more of an impost than anything else. However, I learned a lot when I became a member of parliament, particularly when I had the privilege of being a minister. I learned that, by and large, the public servants in this state, irrespective of the colour of the government of the day, work very hard and are loyal, professional and dedicated to the requirements of their government. Today, it is very sad to see tens of thousands of public servants being treated in a most shabby way in relation to even basic respect for the work they do. It is interesting that that is confirmed when I attend functions and people say to me, 'We would much rather have your government back in power. At least it showed interest, care and support for the Public Service.' This government should be condemned for its shocking attitude to the Public Service.

I turn now to the speech by His Excellency, Mr Bruno Krumin AM, the Lieutenant-Governor. The speech was well presented by the Governor's Deputy, but we have to understand that it is not the Governor or the Governor's Deputy who writes the speech: it is written by the spin doctors from the Rann government. Had you been in a vacuum for 12 months and come back for the opening of the next session, you would have thought—

*Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:*

**Mr BROKENSHERE:** As the member for Kavel says, the government has, effectively, entered a vacuum, because it is not going anywhere—nor is this state when you read this disappointing speech. If you read this speech, it was almost what was in—

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** I rise on a point of order, sir. It is, of course, legitimate for the opposition in the Address in Reply to take issue with the content of the Governor's speech, but I think that the member for Mawson has transgressed standing orders about reflection on His Excellency, the holder of the vice-regal office, by continually

drawing attention to the identity of the person delivering the speech.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I do not believe that was the case. The honourable member did indicate his respect for the Deputy Governor, so I do not think there is a point of order. He is commenting on the speech, which, as we know, is written by the government.

**Mr BROKESHIRE:** Thank you again for your protection, sir, and the comment that the speech is written by the Deputy Governor. I have all the time in the world for the Governor and the Deputy Governor, but I do not have any time for this document, because it shows no vision or strength of direction. It shows no innovation, sustainability or creativity for the future of South Australia. It is a very bland document, and most of its content is a repeat of the last couple of speeches.

The speech talks about growing prosperity. I ask you to go out into the community and ask the thousands of women who have lost their jobs in this state over the past year and who want to help put bread and butter on their dinner table: where is their growing prosperity? I ask you to ask those people in South Australia being visited by the Western Australian Labor Premier and his people and being told 'If you want a job, come to Western Australia. We will have you': where is their growing prosperity?

The next section of the speech talks about improving wellbeing. It talks about first steps forward and health reform. I would have thought that fundamental health reform would mean that people were not lying on a barouche for 24 hours before they were given proper triage by the medical staff in a hospital; and I can tell the house that that is happening, because the triage administered to my constituent was done by the paramedic. My constituent lay on a barouche for 24 hours before she received proper treatment; and she only got that when she was discharged and went back to her GP who then diagnosed a problem. It was not long before she was back in hospital; and the only benefit was that, at least, she knew what the problem was.

The Governor's speech talks about attaining sustainability, but sustainability can be attained only if you have a government that is really focused on the business of government, that is, watching the trend indicators and, as has been said, providing real opportunities. But you have stalled your economy, as far as business planning is concerned, when it takes you 12 months to respond to the recommendations of the Economic Development Board's summit. You have an industry, trade and development area which worked so hard when we were in government but which now feels that it is decimated by this government.

Many people within that area went on secondment because they were left in the lurch. They were left rudderless because, for a couple of years, there was no direction. You start to see that attaining sustainability in South Australia will become far more difficult. I call on this government to forget about playing politics all the time and forget about coming out of the middle of cabinet to do a radio interview. I call on the cabinet to focus on getting back in place structures that will reverse the serious trend indicators that we are seeing at the moment. I ask the government to reverse the serious trend indicator decline that we are seeing at the moment, because you cannot run a business unless you have your hands on the steering wheel.

This government is yet to realise that its number one role is to run the government's business. As former premier Olsen said to me—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr BROKESHIRE:** Both former premiers of the Liberal government will go down in history as premiers who actually rebuilt the state. They did not let it just bubble along in its own way and see it slowly go into decline. They did work hard. They made the tough decisions and, with their team, we saw what can happen, namely, good economic times for several years. But this government is not taking that same approach.

*Ms Thompson interjecting:*

**Mr BROKESHIRE:** Of course, the member for Reynell is a classic. The whole time that we were rebuilding the state after the State Bank debacle, the member for Reynell was saying, 'Boy, when can I get out of my shop steward position and get into parliament?' I have never heard the honourable member apologise for the deplorable situation in which the Labor Party left our state in 1993. When the member for Reynell did come into parliament, instead of supporting us to rebuild the state, all I ever heard her say were negative comments about pulling our hard work apart. That is all I ever heard the member for Reynell say.

It is very sad that the member for Reynell would not help us in a constructive manner when we were in government. We are happy to help in a constructive manner by making contributions (as we are doing right at the moment), which show the government where it is going wrong and, hopefully, in the next 18 months, it will take the opportunity to become a government and stop thinking about heading towards the polling booths, because that is all we are seeing. I want to conclude my remarks by referring to a few areas in the south that are of particular concern to me.

It is disappointing to note that very few new projects in the south are being put in place by this government. We have seen a lot of economic growth in the southern areas over the past five or six years, as well as investment infrastructure, such as the Southern Expressway, together with the so-called 'sea change' that is occurring with baby boomers moving to the coast. We have seen a lot of growth in the southern area. However, we are not seeing the capital works from the government to match that growth. Now, of course, we are starting to see more and more bottlenecks with our traffic, and we are seeing further demands on our health services without those facilities being built.

As the local member, I am very concerned about the Aldinga area because it has an impact on my own electorate. I am also concerned as the shadow minister for the southern suburbs that the government has allowed so much development to go on there without actually getting in early and planning for infrastructure, particularly in the way of health services, community services, and road and sewerage infrastructure. So now we have a compounding problem down there, because several times this year, including just recently, when you pick up the local paper you see reports from Dr Dyson, a well-respected specialist in the field of environmental matters, saying that there is significant leakage from SA Water's sludge ponds into the estuary and the Onkaparinga River. The government has done nothing to address that.

I acknowledge that there were potential problems with that sludge pond when we were in government. What I find interesting is that the member for Kaurna, who is now the minister for environment, was very happy to come out in the paper and attack us about that. We started to work through those areas, addressing problems of sewerage infrastructure. We put many millions of dollars into the upgrade of the

treatment plant at Christies Beach. With the private sector, we put in a new sewerage plant just out of Sellicks-Aldinga to cope with that. We also worked with the private sector to get the recycled water project back into the Willunga basin. However, we have not seen any work by this government since we left office to address the problems we face with sewerage and sludge ponds.

I call upon the minister for environment, now that he has the opportunity to really do something, to fight for the people of the south, for the environment and for the Onkaparinga estuary, and fix that sludge pond problem before it gets to a point where the environmental damage is irreparable. I call on the minister to do that because, more and more, I am being told by people in our area that they are seeing less and less delivery of infrastructure and support to our southern region, and they want more than the shop front southern suburbs office; they want actual delivery of infrastructure.

I want to finish my remarks with one of my pet parliamentary interests: that is, illicit drug use. We did not hear much from the Premier when he was leader of the opposition and we were fighting for illicit drug reform. To give credit where it is due, probably the only support I got from the opposition when it came to getting tougher on illicit drugs was through the Attorney-General. All of a sudden, once the Labor Party got into government, we saw the Premier wanting to be the champion of fighting illicit drug use. Some of us went to a drugs summit—can you vaguely remember that in your mind?

*The Hon. M.R. Buckby interjecting:*

**Mr BROKENSHIRE:** Glossy brochures were put out, and there were major statements by the Premier but, as the honourable member for Light said, did anything extra happen from that? Yes, it did. There has been an increase in drug trafficking, and more people have been getting involved in the use of illicit drugs. There has been growth in amphetamine use, and cannabis hydroponics is still a major problem. We are sadly seeing more and more young people taking on a life of illicit drug use. We know that, first, the earlier young people become involved in illicit drug use, the greater their chances are of using very hard drugs such as speed, ecstasy, ice and other amphetamines; and, secondly—

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** That's what the Greens want to sell over the counter.

**Mr BROKENSHIRE:** The Greens want to sell it over the counter. I do not know what they are smoking when they develop their policies, but I tell you what, I think I know, it has to be very green and smelly, I would suggest—the old cannabis. The point is that we are not addressing the fundamental problem regarding illicit drug matters in this state, that is, enforcement. Yes, you have to have a holistic approach to a drug strategy. I was privileged to be on the Liberal government's subcommittee of cabinet on drug strategy; it was holistic. However, the problem is that you have to tackle it at the front end and that means a bigger fight from an enforcement point of view, which means more police officers in that area—and that is simply not happening. When we were in government, 36 officers were dedicated to Operation Mantle. We have seen no increase in that number.

I congratulate the Police Commissioner and his policemen and women on the work they are doing, but I know their resources are not sufficient. If the Premier and the Labor Party were really serious about combating the illicit drug problems which manifold into major social problems throughout the state, they would become more serious about enforcement of illicit drug trafficking.

Time expired.

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher):** First, I express my appreciation for the role performed by Her Excellency the Governor and the Deputy Governor. We have a long tradition in this state of having had excellent Governors and Deputy Governors, and that tradition is continuing. I wish to canvass a few issues. If members take out the Christmas-New Year period, when not much tends to happen, we really have only a little over 12 months before the next state election. In reflecting on where we are at, I think it is very important that, whilst the government has done some good things, it does not get into a situation where we get the old cockiness and that touch of arrogance emerging, because that is something the public is not willing or keen to see happen. I am trying to encourage the government to do some major reforms and to be innovative in areas of public transport and so on.

I believe that within the government there is still a reluctance to be as innovative as it could be, and I will come to some of those points later. A year or so ago, I would have thought that the next election was pretty well a given in terms of the government's being re-elected, but it has to be careful that it delivers on things to which people can relate. People are looking to see more police on the beat. We are promised more police; I have not seen the actual evidence for that. We are told that more money is going into education. My secondary schools tell me that they have not seen it. Presumably it is going into primary schools. We have not seen much achievement yet in relation to lowering power prices. That is a very difficult issue to address. I think the matter of the interconnector, the so-called Riverlink, has probably passed us by in more ways than one because, by the time it is constructed (if it is, getting around the legal obstacles), the surplus power will probably not be available in New South Wales, anyway.

I think the government—and the opposition, for that matter—are at a very crucial stage now in relation to performing and ensuring that they offer and provide what the community is seeking. The community does not want spin, rhetoric or any massaging: they want some results which transform and translate into benefits for them and their family. One of the issues which I have been pushing for a long time (and still have not had success)—and in this regard I am supported by the member for Napier—is to try to elevate the provision and teaching of technology in our secondary schools. Many of our secondary schools offer something in the way of vocational education and training, but they are not offering it at the advanced level in the way that they could and should. I have been campaigning strongly for Reynella East High School to be one of the technology high schools, and the member for Napier has been arguing in relation to Craigmare High School. For some reason, within the bureaucracy there seems to be a view that the current high school secondary arrangement—the one size fits all approach—is adequate. It is not.

This week I wrote to the Premier and the Minister for Education and pointed out that a lot of the vocational education available through our secondary schools is really only sophisticated craft; it is not high-tech. Some, like Reynella East, offer modest programs in robotics, but there is not much in the way of advanced electronics. The high schools have to provide occupational health and safety welfare programs, and I do not deny the need to do that. But what is happening is that they are being forced to run very extensive occupational health, safety and welfare programs

to the point where the students lose interest in the activity that that safety focus is supposed to be providing. That needs to be looked at, because the young people are really getting courses in occupational health, safety and welfare. They need some of that, but they do not need the amount that is being pushed on them at the moment in lieu of technological training. There is an opportunity for the government to act in relation to the provision of higher level technology in secondary schools, and the challenge is there for it to do so. There is a high school in the south and in the north ready, willing and able to be part of it, and I want to see the government do something about it.

In relation to secondary schools, I have been concerned to hear from school principals about the proposal from DECS that it is changing the funding formula for secondary schools—and, presumably, primary schools as well. That in itself is not a bad thing, because some change is necessary. However, I was very concerned to hear that schools which engage in green energy, for example, which is one of the Premier's keen policy directions, are being told by head office (that is, Flinders Street) that any savings in that area will be returned to DECS. That is silly. It means that the schools will not introduce solar panels or movement activated switches. In fact, one of my high schools is about to cancel what it was going to do in terms of movement activated switches—if the money saved is going to go into head office, it said 'Forget it.' It is already committed to solar panels. I have raised that issue with the minister and with the Premier, and whomever in the department is pushing this clawback on green initiatives ought to be told not to continue with that unproductive and, I think, negative approach to schools wanting to contribute to a green energy strategy.

I am concerned about the funding proposals. As I understand it (and I have not heard the answer from the department), schools will not be funded for some time in terms of extra enrolments with which they have to cope; they will be paid down the track. As we know, when it comes to bureaucracies, the track can often be quite long. I do not dispute the need to reform the funding package to schools, but it must be equitable, fair and reasonable. In my letter to the minister I said, 'Let us make sure that the principals and the chairpersons of school councils have some input before that package is finalised so that we get people with hands-on experience making a contribution to the development of a sensible package.'

There are many other issues. I was pleased to see that the Premier was seeking to reform the upper echelons of the Public Service. I am not someone who gets into bashing the Public Service, and I am sure that he was not either, but there is something lacking, particularly in the middle and senior levels of the Public Service. I do not know whether their innovative streak has been crushed—whether they have been suppressed for too long—but I am not seeing the innovative and creative thinking that we need in our Public Service. Just changing the tenure of senior public servants in itself may help, but I do not think that it is the total answer. We need to get young people with vision and creativity into the Public Service so that we can drive South Australia. It is not the fault of any one government or political party, but we used to lead in a lot of areas. In the past decade or so, rather than being a leader in many areas of public initiative South Australia has fallen behind somewhat.

The issue of shop trading hours over the Christmas period is attracting my attention at the moment. On six out of the 10

days of the Christmas-New Year period stores will be closed. Some people say that they don't care. In fact, someone told me this morning that they are more interested in whether the hotels are open, and I am sure they are, but we have an unusual situation this year, a one in seven or a one in 11 year event, depending on whom you talk to. Because of changes to the shop trading hours and the way the public holidays fall, as I said, on six out of the 10 days you will not be able to shop in a supermarket or a department store.

As a shopaholic, I find that disturbing, but that is not the reason for my concern. People have become accustomed to shopping more frequently, so shops being closed for four days in a row at Christmas will place quite a restriction on their opportunity to buy fresh food and vegetables. Some people say, 'Let them go to the servos.' Prices in those places do not suit the pocket of pensioners and many poorer families, particularly in the northern, southern and western suburbs.

Other issues arise. Because of this four-day shutdown, hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of produce will have to be thrown out. One major store said that they will throw out about \$350 000 worth of fresh food because they will not be able to get supplies on the Friday before Christmas and those food stocks will have passed their expiry date by the time they reopen on the Wednesday. So, convenience is one issue; wastage is another.

Other issues include the fact that many part-timers will not be able to earn any income, and the post-Christmas sales will be delayed. I understand the position of the SDA. To its credit, it has accommodated the changes that have taken place over the past year or so, but I am trying to work with Don Farrell and others to see whether we can come up with some sort of a compromise so that only staff who volunteer can be asked to work on, for example, Proclamation Day. Make Proclamation Day a trading day—still keep it as a holiday and the New Year's Day holiday as part of that package—with the shop assistants who work being paid double time and a half. Retailers have told me that they are willing to pay that because it is a good trading time.

I personally cannot see a problem if only volunteers are used—that is protected by legislation—and if they are paid double time and a half. We are not asking for every day to be a shopping day, but this is an unusual situation. So, I make a plea to Don Farrell, the SDA and retailers to allow Adelaide to have some shopping time over and above that which is currently allowed by law during the Christmas-New Year period. Having the whole of the city shut down for six days out of 10 will not send a very good signal to tourists or potential investors in South Australia.

Another issue in which I am particularly interested is identity fraud. When a young constituent of mine attempted to get her learner's permit, she was told that there was a problem because her face matched another name that they already had. It turned out that this young lass had given her identity to a schoolmate so that her friend could access the nightclub scene.

Further inquiries tell me that this has been a very widespread practice, but what people do not realise (and this is to the credit of Rod Frisby, Registrar of Motor Vehicles, and the Department of Road Transport) is that they now have a computer checking system. When someone is fronting for a learner's permit, going off their Ps or changing anything to do with a licence involving a photograph, they can immediately check to see whether the photograph matches the other details. This is a huge problem and is, no doubt, one of the

reasons why the Premier was concerned about people under age getting into night clubs. There has been significant rorting of the system by young people giving identity details to their mates, who then have access to a proof of age card and can use that to get into a nightclub.

The young people I have spoken to say, 'What's the big deal: this has been going on for years?' It is a bigger deal now of course because, as members know, we have terrorism amongst us, not in our immediate environment but as a potential threat. Having someone else's identity in a false way is a very serious matter. I commend the Registrar of Motor Vehicles for the action that has been taken in trying to counter what is seen by young people as not important but which is very important in terms of potential abuse. Some other matters relating to transport deserve attention. On the matter of Black Road, which has become more like Blue Hills Road because it has been a saga going on and on, the City of Onkaparinga indicated to me recently that it was concerned that Transport SA would be requiring an even bigger contribution from it than the existing agreed \$1.2 million.

That is a lot of money for a council to put towards an arterial road, and that bigger issue of arterial roads and the contribution from councils needs to be explored. I am making quite clear that, if there is any attempt to delay that project or to impose further costs on the City of Onkaparinga, there will be steam coming out of my ears. My community has waited a long time for this road to be upgraded. The community does not ask for much, and this is one thing that it wants to happen, and it needs to happen soon. I will not be impressed if games are played by Transport SA in terms of trying to screw more money out of the City of Onkaparinga in relation to a contribution towards what is a very busy arterial road. My message to the minister (who, to her credit, has been supportive) and to the department is: let us get on with the upgrade of Black Road.

I do not have a problem with the possible sale of Cheltenham Racecourse per se: that is not in my neck of the woods. But I will be concerned if, as a result of that, there is any long-term damage to the parklands and, in particular, to the area adjacent to Victoria Park Racecourse. I have not seen any detail and will be curious to see it, but I will be very concerned if the sale of that racecourse at Cheltenham results in any attempt to further damage or impinge on the parklands. The parklands have had enough damage done to them over time and we do not want any more.

The issue of driver training has been close to my heart for a long time. I am still trying to get Transport SA to get serious about using computer simulation to assist driver training, through software packages, Game Boy-type and arcade-type computer simulation. The NRMA in New South Wales provides a free CD-ROM to anyone who wants it. We are not doing enough to help people understand the risks of wet weather driving, night-time driving and so on. We have in Adelaide companies that produce this training material for long-distance train drivers and for earth movers, and we train people here to fly aircraft using simulators and simulation technology. I would like to see us lead in this area rather than dragging our feet, which sadly has been the case for far too long. It relates to the point that I made before about people in the Public Service being innovative.

I turn now to mental health. Sadly, in recent times I think there has been (not necessarily deliberately, but I think as a consequence of some of the publicity recently about mental health and the justice system) an attempt to demonise people who have a mental health affliction. Not only do the people

who have such an illness directly suffer but the family suffers as well. I was pleased that the government announced an inquiry into the interface between mental health and the justice system. Anyone who has observed the justice system would know that probably one third of the people fronting up in courts have a psychiatric or psychological problem, or a personality disorder of one kind or another. Some of them are not treatable, but many are, and our facilities trying to care for those with a mental health problem are under great pressure to accommodate and treat them.

I have no doubt that the upsurge in mental health issues is the result of drug taking. I have absolutely no doubt in my mind that amphetamines are contributing significantly to the problem, and we need to try to tackle that as much as we can. In relation to those who have a mental illness, whether it is schizophrenia or whatever, we need to deal with that issue. The evidence is increasingly accumulating that marijuana has been a triggering factor in relation to the increase in mental illness, but I make a plea to people not to demonise those who, through no fault of their own, have a mental illness. They are not savages and they are not animals; they are human beings who need help and treatment. The police try to deal with them as best they can. Hopefully, out of this review that has been commissioned we might see some positive changes and improvements in our system.

Council rates have had quite a bit of publicity in recent times, and members would be aware that I canvassed the possibility of capping rate increases beyond CPI or having some local government index roughly comparable to CPI. Where it was above that the council would have to go to the Economic and Finance Committee to get the increase endorsed. I have held back on introducing or giving notice of that measure because the Minister for Local Government has indicated to me that he has something in the pipeline. I will see what he does.

It is easy to blame councils and make them the whipping person, but the reality is that they are at the bottom of the money tree when it comes to getting a share of commonwealth/state finances. As I have argued on many occasions, unless you redress the imbalance in that funding and revenue sources from the federal/state government arena, local government has very little room to move except for property taxes and parking fines. That is a fundamental issue that needs to be addressed.

In terms of councils themselves, and this is expressed by way of resolution to be dealt with by the house, I think in the metropolitan area at least we have 19 councils, and many of them have their own computing centres. One council told me the other day that its computer centre cost \$5 million, and it is not shared with anyone else. To me that seems crazy. Why have 19 councils with their own computing facilities? I am told that only six of the 19 jointly tender for anything. Why can they not jointly tender for their vehicles? Why can they not have consistency in rubbish collection? Some of them cooperate in that area. We still have not moved to a point where they have consistency in rubbish bins and sizes, and recycling and green waste. We have different approaches to all sorts of things. Some people would say that that is good and that it shows local variation, but some of it is not necessary, and it is very costly having 19 groups in the metropolitan area administering council responsibilities without coordination. I am trying to get those 19 councils to work closely together and to share resources. In the long run that would help to take pressure off some of the rate increases we have seen in recent times.

Another aspect in relation to councils is that some, not all, have taken on responsibilities which are not really their core business. I do not believe councils should be into things such as export incentives. That is the responsibility of state and federal governments. I think they need to stick to issues which are traditional areas. Some do not provide libraries while some do. We have a mishmash of services, but some councils are getting into areas which should be left to state and federal governments to undertake with their greater resources and expertise.

I will not canvass in any detail the laws to deal with hoon driving (because that is before the house), but I am delighted that, at last, that matter will be taken on board. I know that both the opposition and the government have been supportive of that matter. I do not believe there is any issue in the community that the community wants more than something to deal with hoon driving behaviour. Constant harassment occurs day and night in suburbs, in playgrounds, on council reserves and council ovals, and so on, and the day that law is in place will be a day of celebration for many South Australians.

I am sure that every member has had parents come along and say, 'We can no longer control our children, because you have taken away our rights.' As we know, that is not true. Parents still have rights. They do not have the right to abuse or harm their children or to smack them around the head. Recently, I pursued this matter with the Attorney-General, the Minister for Health and the Minister for Families and Communities. I was very pleased a few days ago to get a response from the Attorney-General agreeing that parents feel as though they have no rights to discipline or control their children. That is a perception with which he agrees. He has agreed that a proposal for a guide to parents is a good one, and he has asked his officers to draft in succinct and earthy language (which I am sure he will check) a guide which could be provided to parents. He is not keen on having a parents' charter or a single act setting out the duties of parents.

I was trying to get together the key aspects which parents have to deal with. On the one hand they can be required to support their children at tertiary study until they are 24; on the other hand, they are told that at 15 a child can leave home and they have no say in it. I am trying to get this matter clarified, simplified and expressed in a way in which people can understand it, without continuing with the false perception that they have no right to control their children. We have not been able to bash children around the head for as long as I can remember, but parents can still punish in a responsible way without resorting to that form of child abuse. I am pleased the Attorney-General has responded to that issue in that way.

I know this matter is close to the heart of the member for Playford. As someone who pushed strongly for significant trees legislation—and I am pleased we have legislation and rules in place—despite the review last year I think we need to refine and tune up the legislation and rules somewhat. Some councils are interpreting it in a way which is not allowing sensible management of trees. A lot of people do not distinguish between conservation, which is the management of natural resources or the natural environment, and preservation, which is a 'don't touch' approach. The significant trees legislation, and what I always had in mind, allows that people would be able to manage—so that if a tree posed a real threat to a house it could either be pruned or gotten rid of. It does not mean that you are not allowed to touch any trees ever—that is just silly. But what is happening (and it

comes back to a point I made before) is that, because of these huge variations, there can be enormous disparity literally between what is happening on one side of the street and what is happening on the other, even in the metropolitan area.

So, I am appealing to the Minister for Urban Planning to let us see if we can fine tune the rules and the law a little so that we can get some consistency and a bit more common-sense in the way in which trees are managed in the urban environment. We want to protect the big ones, but we have to be able to live and deal with them in a sensible way and a way that does not pose a threat to property or life.

There are many other topics which I cannot canvas but which, no doubt, I will have an opportunity to raise in the weeks ahead—some of which are very important matters which concern the people in my electorate.

Time expired.

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop):** I would like to start by acknowledging the good work that Her Excellency the Governor and her deputy Mr Bruno Kruminis, who delivered the speech on the occasion of the opening of the Fourth Session of the Fiftieth Parliament, do for South Australia, and particularly for the people of South Australia. South Australia has been blessed for a significant time now with the people holding the vice-regal position, who have performed very well and done excellent work for the state. Having said that, like my colleague the member for Mawson, I cannot be nearly as praiseworthy about the content of the speech that was delivered by His Excellency the Governor's Deputy.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr WILLIAMS:** As my colleague says, if he had written it, it would have been better—well, if anyone else had written it, it would have been a lot better. I must say, to start off with, that I am delighted to be involved in this debate. There have been a number of members of this house, and of the media, over the years who have talked about things to do with parliamentary reform and they have suggested that some of the debates we have—like the Address in Reply—are a waste of time. I fully support members being able to contribute in this debate; I fully support the government, at least on an annual basis, being obliged to put forward an overall summation of where they are heading and what they intend to do in the next 12 months (which, of course, is what the Governor's speech is); and I fully support members of the house being able to comment on matters raised in that speech. Some members do take the liberty of ranging much wider than matters that have been canvassed in the Governor's speech—and I may well do a little of that myself—but I think it is important that members of this parliament do have this particular opportunity.

I have heard today and a number of times over the preceding at least 12 months, and probably longer than that, that whenever the opposition raises an issue members of the government say, 'You had eight years and what did you do in eight years?' I will just put in context the difference between what the current government inherited 2½ years ago and what we inherited a little over 10 years ago when we first came to government—and when I say we, I am talking about the previous Liberal government. We inherited a state on the verge of bankruptcy; it was probably technically bankrupt, or very close to it. A bit over two years ago when the current government came to power it inherited a very robust economy; an economy which was exporting at an incredible rate, a rate that had never been seen in this state before. We were bringing in many dollars to fund the needs of this state—up

to \$9 billion of export income, money which was used to fund the needs of this state and to help us get on top of the \$9 billion debt we had inherited.

So, it is a no-brainer to suggest that the previous government had the opportunities to do some of the things that are needed in South Australia that this current government has. That is why we get frustrated. We had in the pipeline and we had in our sights a lot of things to do to allow South Australia to continue to forge ahead and to take its rightful place in this nation and in this world. This government has tripped and stumbled, and, all of a sudden, we find ourselves spiralling backwards. That is why we are frustrated and why we have become even more frustrated and more cynical when members of the government say, 'What did you do?' This government has no sense of history if it has to even ask that question. History will show that the previous Liberal government did one hell of a lot for this state.

*Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:*

**Mr WILLIAMS:** My colleague the member for Kavel says that they are embarrassed. They have every right to be embarrassed, and they will become more embarrassed as time goes on. One of the things that has fascinated me, and it really came to the forefront of my mind as I sat down and read through the Governor's speech, subsequent to the delivery, and I thought, 'What is this government really doing and what has it got planned?' I came to the conclusion: how quickly this government has become tired. We know that it has been arrogant from day one—that is obvious, and everyone can see that—but how quickly it has become tired. It has run out of ideas. The Governor's speech is littered with re-announcements.

*Mrs Redmond interjecting:*

**Mr WILLIAMS:** My colleague says that it is littered with rhetoric. I would barely call it rhetoric, because I do not think it comes to the level of rhetoric. Generally, when governments are in their first term at least, they are full of vitality and new ideas and things to do, and they are running at a pace with which they can barely keep up, trying to implement all their ideas. This government is struggling; it is dawdling; it is tired; and it is bereft of ideas. Why would it be like that? Because that is the way they came to power. They had no ideas when they came to power. You may not have taken the time to look, Madam Acting Speaker, but I and lot of my colleagues looked at the Labor Party's web site prior to the last election to see what its policies were, and in a lot of those areas we found blanks—transport, no policy; tourism, no policy. When they came to power they had no policy in a whole raft of areas and very nebulous and small ideas in other areas. That is why this government has already run out of puff. In the meantime, it has slowed down the rest of South Australia to its very mediocre pace. That is one of the problems that South Australia is facing over the ensuing period.

The one thing this government is very good at is perception politics, and I give it credit for that. A few moments ago, we heard my colleague talking about Media Mike. It is one thing that the government is very good at, but perception politics will not last. It will not see the distance, because those poor South Australians out there who are losing their jobs, those exporters who are struggling to get their produce off the wharves and into the world markets, those South Australians who are struggling to get decent health care, and those who are struggling to have their children educated to the extent they expect, will, at the end of the day, see through perception politics. They will eventually say, 'The opposition

is correct. That Mike Rann and his mob there, who keep berating anyone who questions them, are shallow; they are, in fact, just bullies. They do not have policies or answers. They have no plan or vision for the future. The only plan or vision they have is to try to bully the media and create a perception in order to keep themselves in power. That is the only plan that this government has, unfortunately, and it will not last.

The Governor's speech started by talking about the state's strategic plan, and this is one of those areas of perception politics that we were talking about.

*Mr Snelling interjecting:*

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Thank you, Jack. This government has made much about the state's strategic plan, and I asked a question in the house only yesterday of the Minister for Agriculture: what has he done to fulfil the request of the Farmers Federation in its triple bottom line for the bush document? Their initial request was that 'the South Australian government and the South Australian Farmers Federation work in partnership to establish a task force to develop a comprehensive strategic plan to ensure a sustainable triple bottom line for rural and regional South Australia'. I would have thought that was a pretty sensible ask by the Farmers Federation representing its constituency (the farming community and regional and rural South Australia). I would have thought that would have been a fair ask. What did the minister say? He said, 'Eh, eh, eh! We're not about doing this. We have a strategic plan, and it is everybody's strategic plan.'

**The Hon. S.W. Key:** That's right. Just embrace it, Mitch.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Yes, 'and it's already there and we don't have to do any more.' When I was reading the Governor's speech I thought, 'I think the minister got that wrong', because the Governor said they would develop a whole lot of new strategic plans—they will have a state-wide work force development strategy; they will have a review of the trainee and apprenticeship system; and they will have a strategic infrastructure plan, an export strategy and develop a state manufacturing strategy. 'We are not going to talk to the Farmers Federation because we are not going to develop a strategy for rural and regional South Australia,' according to the Minister for Agriculture who, I think, was the minister for regional development not so long ago.

I think he has failed to read the Governor's speech, because other people in the government say that the strategic plan that is currently on the table is not really the complete strategic plan—and, obviously, it is not, because it is not a strategic plan. It is neither a strategy nor a plan. We started with a framework for economic development in South Australia. That is where we started—a framework for economic development. When that was questioned, we got from the government the statement, 'No, this is just a framework. We will develop the plan.' Now we have the plan but, when we question that, they say, 'No, that is not the whole thing. We are going to do all these other things.' Two and a half years into this four year term—

**Mr Goldsworthy:** Like noodle nation!

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Like noodle nation, yes. We are two and a half years in and, suddenly, we are going to go through another lot of strategic planning. I will guarantee that, at the end of the term of this government, the people of South Australia will still be wondering what their strategy was and what their plan was, because they have neither.

**The Hon. M.R. Buckby:** We are wondering what happened to the first plan, let alone the second plan.



**Mr WILLIAMS:** That is right. This is only about perception politics. They can say, 'We are gunna do this' only for so long before they get the moniker 'the gunna Rann government'. I can assure the house that they are gunna do very little.

This speech talked about the high rate of youth unemployment. The Lieutenant Governor said, 'We are working hard on it.' He said:

The Social Inclusion Board and the Economic Development Board are mobilising the public sector to work more flexibly and collaboratively. Such partnerships will be the foundation on which long-term improvements in employment opportunities for all young South Australians will be achieved.

How? That says absolutely nothing. As my colleague from the seat of Stuart would say, 'Sir Humphrey is alive and well.' In this government he is alive and well, because we get plenty of words.

**The Hon. S.W. Key:** Except that he would get it right.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** He would, too. He has said it a bit more often than I have. It is difficult for me to get my words out because I am despairing of what is happening to this state. Let me discuss some of these so-called strategies that are going to be developed over the next 12 to 18 months. They will probably be dropped out as policies at the next election. Take the work force strategy; we are going to develop a work force strategy. I think that this government is brilliant with the way it handles work force matters. We read in the paper about firms coming from interstate in the hunt for skilled workers.

We have a skills shortage right across Australia, probably right across the Western world. We read that the Western Australian government and major industries in Queensland are going to send teams down here to interview some of those 700 people who unfortunately will be laid off at Mitsubishi Motors at Tonsley. We read in the paper that, at the same time, ETSA is seeking skilled workers from overseas to work for it. It seems that there is something wrong here: ETSA is going overseas to get people to work for it, yet other states are coming here to pick up displaced workers in South Australia. One only has to think back a bit and say, 'Why would that be?' One would then realise that members of this government have been running around abusing and berating companies like ETSA that are involved in the power industry, calling them bloodsuckers and that sort of thing, and then wonder—

**The Hon. S.W. Key:** Who?

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Who? Your Premier and your Treasurer are running around calling good South Australian companies bloodsuckers and then wonder why these companies have to go offshore to get people to work for them. A work force strategy: belt everybody who has caused a little problem for you, and then see them suffer. That is the sort of work force strategy that we see coming out of this government. I think it is outrageous. The first thing you can do, if you have a problem with a lack of skilled workers in South Australia and you want to develop a work force strategy, is to cut the cost of TAFE and allow young unskilled people to get trained.

**The Hon. S.W. Key:** Why didn't you do that when you were in government?

**Mr WILLIAMS:** I have already explained that we had no money because we came in after another one of your governments that had no idea about how to run the economy. I have already explained that.

**Mr Snelling:** More excuses.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** More excuses, more excuses! I would love to have the opportunity that you lot have had, and I certainly would not do what you are doing with it.

**Mr Snelling:** You are not going to.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** I know. The member is dead right. Unfortunately, I am not going to because, every time we come into government, we follow you lot—that is the problem. We will never get the opportunity that we give you every time you come into government. So, the member for Playford is dead right.

**The Hon. S.W. Key:** So, how come you were an independent when you came in the first time?

**Mr WILLIAMS:** You have even got that wrong. You go back and look at the record: you have even got that wrong. I would suggest that there are some positive things that we can do. We can support South Australian companies and we can do something about the training system through TAFE, and we do not need a heap of bureaucrats and highly-paid consultants sitting around developing a work force strategy plan. You do not have to be a rocket scientist to work out what is going on.

The speech talks about an infrastructure plan. We damn well need one, because this government does not know anything about infrastructure. It talks about some of the infrastructure recently built in South Australia and about the Darwin to Alice Springs railway line. We will take 99 per cent of the credit for that. It talks about some of the things happening now, like the deepening of the port of Adelaide.

*The Hon. S.W. Key interjecting:*

**Mr WILLIAMS:** I wish it would happen, because South Australia will be struggling. We can see what is happening in the port of Melbourne, and South Australian companies are looking over there, because the South Australian government will not get off its backside and ensure that Outer Harbor is dredged to a reasonable depth in a timely fashion. Once companies invest in their own infrastructure and systems to get their produce shipped out of other ports, it will be very hard to get them back, and this government has failed to recognise that. We have the bridges down there, but nobody knows what is happening. Hopefully we will get a bridge at some stage.

They also talk about Adelaide Airport and the terminal. The best thing that ever happened at Adelaide Airport was the extension of the runway. We achieved that in government, to allow cargo planes to land and take off fully loaded at Adelaide International Airport. We were well on the way to getting up the air terminal and everybody in the government knows full well what intervened and caused the delay in that project. One thing they talked about that is new for this government—it is not new for the next year, but it is new for this government—is the Glenelg tramway, but I understand they have even botched that. I understand we will end up with a tram system running between the city and Glenelg that is much less with much inferior tram cars than the government first announced, because it botched that as well.

The Governor talked about developing an export strategy. It is about time the government got on with an export strategy, because we have exports to a level of about \$9 billion a year, which was a great effort, and the government thought it was easy to achieve that. It also thought it was easy to run a bank and make profits the last time it was in government, which nearly destroyed the state. Members opposite think it is easy to treble exports, because they are running around and saying that. I am wondering how they will treble exports because, when I look at the state strategic

plan and the framework for economic development, it simply says that we will triple exports and get to \$25 billion by 2013.

*The Hon. S.W. Key interjecting:*

**Mr WILLIAMS:** There is no plan or strategy. Does anybody in the government understand that 50 per cent of the state's exports come out of the regions? When you look at the 50 per cent that comes out of metropolitan Adelaide and break it down, a fair swag of it has been from the motor industry. Do you honestly believe the motor industry will treble its exports in the next 10 years?

*Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**Mr WILLIAMS:** I have a great faith in Holden's, but I am a realist. I do not believe the South Australian car industry will treble its exports in the next 10 years. It will not happen.

*Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Good on you, because you are doomed to fail. When we look at other activities and industries happening in metropolitan Adelaide, some may be able to treble their exports, but I do not believe its achievable across the board. Increasing exports out of some of the rural areas is achievable. One area is the mining sector, which currently contributes to about 12 per cent of South Australia's exports. A considerable amount of that comes out of Moomba, the Cooper Basin and Roxby Downs. I believe that South Australia is so prospective for minerals that we could treble exports from that sector. However, we will not do so when this government keeps shackling the mining industry.

The Premier and the minister responsible in the other place have said that they are doing everything they can to bolster the mining industry, to increase exploration and to increase investment in the mining sector. What do they do? Just over 12 months ago the government introduced a new set of native vegetation regulations. What did that do? It took away from the mining sector the exemption it had previously enjoyed under the Native Vegetation Act. Miners now have to comply with that act, and they must have a net benefit in native vegetation in any land they disturb. That is not possible for a mining company, because most of the land on which it works is crown land. If a farmer wants to remove native vegetation, he sets aside part of his farm for revegetation, but a mining company cannot do so because the Crown already owns the land. The government thought of this and inserted another section into the act which provided that, instead of setting land aside, mining companies could pay money into a fund.

What the government has done is impose another tax on the mining industry. That would have been bad enough, but it has continued to lock away vast tracts of South Australia from the mining sector. An example is the Yellabinna nature reserve on the West Coast—a huge area of 500 000 hectares which has been locked away from the miners in the past few months. The government has hailed this action as protecting native species, flora and fauna, but not one piece of scientific data supports that proposition.

What the government did was look at the map to find which part of that area was already under mining lease, or had mining lease applications on it, and said, 'This little bit has no lease or applications on it. We will trim that, make a reasonable shape and lock it away.' That is how the process occurred. There was no scientific evidence to suggest that that piece of land, which has been locked away from mining interests, is any more important to the environment than any other piece of land. All the government has done is lock away land from mining interests, exploration and activity and the exporters of South Australia.

Recently, I was given this very interesting statistic by the mining sector: the total mining footprint in this country (bearing in mind the mining footprint in South Australia is relatively small compared with other states) is less than the footprint of the car parks of Australian hotels—not just current mines but all mining activity ever undertaken in Australia. I think that is a great statistic. When governments lock away half a million hectares from miners, as they did at Yellabinna, and say that they are trying to encourage mining, they fail to recognise that the footprint of the mining industry is incredibly small, yet the returns are incredibly large. As a state, we cannot afford to belt the mining industry as we have. Obviously, this government does not care about that, because it has done so. However, we should not arrive at such a position.

The government has developed a population policy, but all it states is that the government wants to increase the population of South Australia. That is a laudable goal and one that I support, but again there is no strategy, no plan and no understanding of how you might or might not achieve it. Again, I come back to the important point that 50 per cent of exports from this state are derived from outside metropolitan Adelaide. Our planning and development problems, and the pressures the population is causing on our environment and our resources (many are financial), occur in metropolitan Adelaide. This government has not and never will develop a reasonable population policy that recognises regional and rural South Australia.

That is where we should be growing the population, not just in Outback South Australia, where we have vast potential for mineral development, but right across South Australia. We should have a policy that says that we are going to take the centres of Mount Gambier, the Riverland (whether it be Berri, Barmera, Renmark or Loxton), the Iron Triangle, Port Augusta (maybe Port Augusta and Whyalla), Port Lincoln and Murray Bridge and that we are going to increase the population of those centres by 10 per cent, 15 per cent, in the next 10 years, and do it in such a way that over the ensuing 10 years we will increase it by another 20 per cent, because we will not suffer the problems that we do in metropolitan Adelaide by growing the population in those centres. We will have work. Currently, we are building houses in Adelaide where there are few jobs, and my electorate is screaming out for housing. We have jobs and we cannot get workers to come and fill them because there is no housing and the government turns its back on it. We do not have a population policy, and what we are doing with regard to population and managing where people live in South Australia is failing miserably.

I said that I was pleased to be able to contribute to this debate. My only lament is that my time is very quickly drawing to a close. I canvassed but a few of the many issues that I wanted to canvass, but I am sure there will be other opportunities for me to bring wise counsel to the government.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart):** This is one of the rare occasions that I get to my feet for this debate, but—

**Mr Snelling:** In your humble way.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** Well, I am a humble person; that is right. I am a humble member. I am pleased to participate in the Address in Reply debate, because it gives me the opportunity to raise a number of issues that are affecting my constituents, and those issues are many and varied. It is an opportunity to—

**The Hon. J.W. Weatherill:** From the perspective of a humble farmer.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** That is right—from one of those groups which has built South Australia and which continues to supply the Treasury with hundreds of millions of dollars for the benefit of the general community.

*Ms Breuer interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** It is all right for the member for Giles, she will be dealing with lots of farmers after the next election. When she is driving out towards Koongawa, I am sure that they will be interested in her views.

**Ms Breuer:** I have big boots to fill.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** Currently, those constituents are represented by the member for Flinders, and in the past they were represented by me. They are good, humble, hard-working people and they have very good judgment when it comes to the ballot box. I would like to congratulate the Governor on the good work that she does for the people of South Australia, and the Lieutenant-Governor who delivered the Governor's address to both houses of parliament. They both play an important role in the South Australian parliamentary system.

I also want to mention those members whose service was acknowledged at the time of their passing. I would like to say again that, when I first became a member of the parliament, the late Mr Corcoran was of considerable help to me, and I greatly appreciated his wise counsel. Mr Casey's farm is in my constituency, at Peterborough, and his family still farms there. I had a lot to do with him. The late Frank Kneebone was the first minister that I had any dealings with when I became a member of parliament, and he also was a very reasonable person to deal with. We all remember fondly Mr Abbott and, of course, my good friend the late John Mathwin who was in this parliament. I had a lot to do with him and his family during our time in this place.

I am interested in some of the measures the government intends to bring to the parliament, because I do not think that some of them will be beneficial to the people of South Australia. The first issue I want to raise is that there has been considerable discussion and debate in relation to the Statutes Amendment (Real Estate Industry Form) Bill.

The bill sets out to change a longstanding South Australian practice in relation to the buying and selling real estate. If there are one or two areas which need to be refined, well and good. However, as they stand, the proposals will have a detrimental effect on those people who run real estate businesses and those who are involved in wanting to buy and sell. The other day one of my constituents in Peterborough said that a large number of his transactions involve someone who has a property to sell and who wants to purchase another one. That concept is going to be outlawed. In many cases, two or three transactions are dependent on one another. Why would you want to stop it if you have a willing seller and a willing buyer? At the end of the day, commonsense must apply. I would say to the government: think this through very carefully, because governments can make mistakes, and with the best intent in the world they sometimes do quite foolish things which have dramatic effects on the industry, and that really does not help anyone. I sincerely hope that the many and varied submissions which have been made by the real estate institute are taken into consideration and accepted prior to bringing in the legislation to the parliament.

The next issue I want to raise is that we are obviously going to have a most vigorous debate about poker machines when that matter comes before the parliament. I have

received a submission on gaming machines from the Provincial Cities Association of South Australia under the hand of their Executive Officer, Mr Ian McSporran, who is known to many people in this place and around South Australia. There are a number of concerns. I understand that one of my constituents from Spalding has written to all members of parliament. There is a problem with Spalding and, obviously, if it is at Spalding it will be elsewhere in the state. The problem of who actually owns the poker machines has been called into question; whether it is the person who owns the hotel, or the person who leases it. I am one of those who believe that the person who actually paid for the poker machine is the one who should own it. The case at Spalding is particularly special, and it is a matter which I hope the Minister for Gambling will take into account and consider very carefully.

There is another problem in relation to this matter. I am no friend of poker machines, and I do not like them. I never invested 10 cents in them, but I am concerned that we have created a property right; if we take it away from someone, they should be compensated. If the government is allowed to get away with it for poker machines, who or what will be next? It is important that we protect people's property rights, because bureaucrats are keen to advise governments on a regular basis, and many of them have no regard for people's property rights, privacy and, certainly, many of them lack commonsense.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** For the benefit of the honourable member who is shaking his head, I could go on at length, but I will not, because there are other things that I want to talk about.

In a grievance debate earlier this week, I referred to the difficulties that people face in relation to the freeholding of agricultural land. I have a letter under the hand of the Chief Executive of the Department of the Environment and Heritage, Allan Holmes. My constituent has written on the top of this letter. A similar letter has, unfortunately, been sent to many people. My constituent writes:

Sending you this letter for you to view. It has gone down as an insult to all land-holders.

I agree with that comment. I have discussed the matter with the minister, and I am pleased to say that the minister had a better understanding and feeling for the subject than Mr Holmes, those who are advising Mr Holmes, those who wrote the letter, or the antifarmer brigade which is involved in sections of the Department for Environment and Heritage. We need to give careful consideration to some of these recommendations. As I indicated to the minister, I am looking forward to knowing who was the architect of this notorious document. It would be interesting to know, because why would anyone want to send out such a misleading, inaccurate and quite scurrilous document which has insulted people who do not deserve to be insulted?

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** It is not the STA again, is it?

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** They are your friends; you have to account for them.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** I am a member.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** I do not know whether I should congratulate you or commiserate with you on that particular matter.

**Ms Breuer:** I am a member of the Farmers Federation.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** So am I.

**The Hon. J.W. Weatherill:** I think we represent more rural electorates these days.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** Beg your pardon?

**The Hon. J.W. Weatherill:** I think we represent more rural electorates per square metre.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** I do not know whether I represent as many rural constituents as I did in the past, but I represent a good number, of whom I am very proud. However, this matter needs to be rectified so that people can freehold their properties and not be sidetracked by these sorts of documents. We still have a problem with surveying all the lots along river frontages, which is a real problem; and we have problems where perpetual leases are subject to mortgages. These matters need to be sorted out quickly so that we can get them off the list. I accept that the previous government could have done more in this area and that some of the ministers had the wool pulled over their eyes by their advisers and that, on some occasions, some of our views were not given enough consideration, but that is behind us. One thing we do know is that, in the future, we will ensure that the policies that are enacted are fair and reasonable and in the public interest.

The freeholding of agricultural land and the creating of secure titles for pastoral leases are absolutely essential. The freeholding of areas where pastoralists have made improvements, particularly in relation to the tourist industry and other industries, is essential. Another problem in outback South Australia is that people need blocks of land so that they can build residences. Currently I am involved with a constituent who wants to build a house at Beltana. Not many people want to build houses at Beltana, but this constituent of mine wants to. It was previously offered to a person under conditional freehold; that is, you take the lease and, when you make improvements on the property to a certain level, it becomes freehold. That is a policy with which I think most of us would agree. However, for some spurious reason people think it is subject to native title. Now my constituent cannot build a house there.

What harm is there in this person building a house at Beltana on an ordinary block of land? What harm is there? It is absolute nonsense of the highest order. The person understands that it is a heritage town—and I am quite happy to comply with those conditions. The block was previously held and not proceeded with, so it went back to the Crown. I refer to another problem at William Creek. One of my constituents has a house block at William Creek and they are trying to charge him \$7 000 to freehold it. I put it to you, Mr Deputy Speaker, that there are not too many people who want to live or build houses at William Creek. Those who do ought to be encouraged and assisted. In my view, \$10 to freehold a housing block is a fair and reasonable thing. My constituents who have built the take-away facility, which is an excellent facility to deal with the travelling public and the tourists, are up for about \$30 000 to freehold their area of land. That is an absolute nonsense.

I again make the point that more and more people will travel through these areas, and they will need services. If people are to provide services there, they need to have a bit of security, but they should not be charged like a wounded bull. I sincerely hope that, during this next session of parliament, those issues can be resolved. There is a need to have people permanently living in these areas, even if some of the Sir Humphreys do not think so. There are not a lot of people who want to live in those areas.

I have been approached by constituents who are most concerned about the lack of relief teachers in country areas of South Australia. The government is receiving an absolute windfall of GST money. It is happy to be in receipt of it, even though it opposed the concept. The money is flowing in but, unfortunately, there does not seem to be much flowing too far north of Adelaide. In a place such as Port Augusta and other areas, where a large number of students attend the education facilities, there will always be a demand for relief teachers. It is my view that we should err on the side of having one or two too many rather than not having enough. At the end of the day, there will always be, for many reasons, people who are not available; who need a day or two off. There is nothing wrong with that: teachers should not be required to attend their place of employment when they have the flu. It has been suggested to me that some of them, because they have a strong commitment to their jobs, are attending when they should not do so. If we have to pay an additional few thousand dollars to have some extra teachers in these areas, I think it is a cost that the taxpayer should bear. At the end of the day, it is terribly important that these young people receive a good education.

The government has indicated that it will increase penalties for people driving under the influence and various other road traffic measures. I do not know who was the architect of these proposals. There has been a program in the Adelaide Hills where people are voluntarily tested before they drive their motor cars. I think that is a very good idea. I have had brought to my attention a letter from the Marrabel Rodeo Club. It is addressed to me, the member for Schubert, the Assistant Commissioner of Police and the Leader of the Opposition, and I think it is worth bringing the house up to date. The letter states:

On the evening of March the 5th the Marrabel Rodeo Club held its annual Marrabel bull ride. Again the event proved to be a huge success with a large well behaved crowd.

And that is good. The letter continues:

Before the event we met with . . . officer at Riverton Station. . . to discuss a number of policing and security issues.

That seems to me to be a wise course of action. The letter further states:

We encourage and support the use of random breath testing units before and after our event and make that known to patrons.

If they are going to be there, people should know. The letter continues:

We do however find an incident that took place the morning after our event puzzling. A young P plate driver approached several of our committee members asking if she could be breath tested before she left, knowing that she had a requirement of a zero alcohol level as part of her probationary licence. The young lady is a country person going to university in Adelaide and could not risk losing her licence. One of our directors. . . drove her to the RBT site about one kilometre to the south of the camping grounds.

At approximately 9.50 a.m. on Sunday 6 March the gentleman in question identified himself as a committee member of the rodeo club, explaining the young lady's predicament. The letter goes on:

The officer refused to breath test the lady claiming that it would be followed by a flood of other requests.

I thought breath tests were a road safety measure. If people ask to be tested to know whether they are within the legal limit, surely that is something we should encourage. That sort of thing has occurred in the Adelaide Hills, and I commend the police for it. The letter continues:

He could not test her as it would prevent him and his partner from testing passing motorists. There were no onlookers and no-one on foot for at least 400 metres. Not one car passed or stopped from the start of [this gentleman's] conversation with the officer. After several more requests by the young lady and [this gentleman] the officer told her that if she had had too much to drink she should not drive.

She was clearly not intoxicated and in our view the young lady and our club took a responsible attitude towards the matter. If officers in the Adelaide Hills can offer voluntary breath tests to people, then why couldn't this young lady's request have been met?

Can you please respond as we are very keen to cooperate as this incident causes us some concern.

In my view, if people act responsibly and want to be tested, this facility should be made available. It is far better to take preventive action. If we are concerned with road safety matters, then we ought to have this facility at all public functions so that people who want to be tested know that they are operating within the law. It seems to me that it would be most appropriate and good for public relations for the police to be involved.

I say to the Commissioner and the minister that I sincerely hope that commonsense will prevail and that what I believe to be a very responsible and worthwhile scheme operating in the Adelaide Hills will be extended to other parts of South Australia. These days, there are not many functions in rural South Australia that do not have voluntary breath tests. At the Yunta races three or four police officers were manning breath test machines. That is fine. However, people should be told they are going to be there so that if they do not have anyone to drive them they will not drink, and if people want to be voluntarily tested in my view they should be.

If the minister intends to bring legislation into the parliament, I will move an amendment—I do not know whether I will be successful—to make breath testing the right of any person if they seek it, so that the police have an obligation and cannot refuse. We should not want to apprehend this many people. We know that on-the-spot fines are not for road safety purposes; they are revenue raising measures. We know this. You have complained about excessive use, Mr Deputy Speaker. So, let's be up front about it and amend the legislation appropriately. It will be interesting to see the sort of reaction that I get if I move an amendment, Mr Deputy Speaker, and I look forward to your support.

I want to raise one or two other matters. A couple of weeks ago when visiting a number of hospitals in my electorate I was most concerned to be told that the suggestion had been made that if hospitals wanted to apply for commonwealth aged care funding in order to provide more facilities or to upgrade existing facilities because there would need to be a capital contribution from the South Australian government they should not apply. We all know that there is an urgent need for ongoing aged care facilities in South Australia—or, for that matter, in Australia. On Sunday, I attended the opening at Yunta by the hard-working and capable member for Grey, Mr Wakelin, of wonderful improvements to the aged care hostel in which a considerable amount of commonwealth money (\$250 000) had been invested, and the community had found a further \$300 000 plus.

These sorts of facilities are required. Therefore, if the commonwealth is going to provide some money, surely the state government will not prevent some small increases in the capacity of these hospitals to provide aged care facilities that are badly needed. I have just been through a case in my constituency of an aged lady (who came from Port Augusta)

who was in the hospital and who, because she had gone beyond the time, was going to have to go to Port Pirie. I firmly believe that aged people should be able to be housed and looked after in their own community. That is the ultimate care that should be given. Therefore, I sincerely hope that the state government will relax these instructions that have been given.

I call upon the Minister for Health to give an unqualified commitment that no country hospital board will be abolished without the approval of the local community. If we are going to have this cooperative course of action to merge hospital boards, then we should hold a public meeting in these localities so that the community comes along and expresses a point of view. That facility at Eudunda that we were involved in last Sunday had tremendous public support because people feel ownership of our hospital and aid facilities. If you take away the right of the local community to be involved, you will take away their support. The local community is always happy to support these facilities, because their own people are involved in running them. And they do so voluntarily: they put in a lot of time and have done an outstanding job for which they should be commended and supported.

But centralising the decision making is contrary to democracy, which is about allowing people to have a say in their own localities. I call upon the minister to ensure that there will be no compulsory amalgamation of the boards and that, prior to any hospital having its board amalgamated or altered, there should be a public meeting, well advertised, to let the community know what the government is going to do. You and I, Mr Deputy Speaker, both know what the results will be if that particular course of action is taken. People will not want to lose their involvement with their local hospitals because most of those communities in the past have made very large contributions towards their operation.

As we commence this next session of parliament, I sincerely hope that the regulations under the Native Vegetation Act will be amended. I am concerned because in most parts of the state we are having a wonderful season and there is a huge build-up of combustible material. We have huge areas of native vegetation that have not been burned or had hazard reduction programs in place for a long time. If these areas catch fire, private land-holders are still prevented from taking appropriate measures. We now see billboards and hear the CFS telling people to take steps now to protect property. You have one arm of government wanting people to do it and another arm of government stopping them. The minister has to accept full responsibility for the damage and for the actions of these people, because these areas are going to catch fire if farmers are prevented from doing sensible, controlled burnoffs for hazard reduction as they have in the past.

It never hurt mallee scrub burning it off. If bushfires hurt mallee scrub, there would be no mallee scrub left in South Australia. You, Mr Deputy Speaker, representing some of the Hills, should know what the problems are. It is terribly important that commonsense prevails. We do not want any more of these little apparatchiks racing round the country with tape measures, checking up on people putting in fire breaks, telling untruths, acting improperly with no regard for people's rights and ignoring the CFS rules. I could have more to say about that.

Some of these people are less than honourable, most unwise, and do not tell the truth. They go onto people's properties and then have not got the guts nor the courage to admit that they have done so, which is a very serious matter

in a democracy, because whether they like it or not people have rights, and those rights should be respected. So, I support the Address in Reply.

I look forward to participating in the debates over the next few months in this place. I am not sure how many Address in Reply speeches I have made, but I have got quite a few more to make in the future. I have enjoyed the opportunity this afternoon to address one or two issues in relation to my constituents and others. I am pleased with the attention that I have received from the house. I can see that members have been waiting with bated breath. I am pleased with the attention that I have received from honourable members who have been courteous enough to listen to me, and I look forward to supporting the measures.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** That is right—a really humble farmer.

**Ms RANKINE (Wright):** I am also pleased to stand and support the Address in Reply motion and thank the Lieutenant-Governor for his presentation on Tuesday. It was an opportunity to outline the vision that this government has for South Australia and its people and our priorities as we go into the next term of this parliament. Included in those priorities is the issue of unemployment, and I congratulate our Minister for Employment on the South Australian Regions at Work program. This is a real initiative that I think we are going to see deliver real outcomes to unemployed people throughout South Australia. They have looked individually at the regions that they are servicing, identifying the target group, whether it is young people, mature age people or indigenous people, and they have developed local strategies in relation to the issues in that particular region. So, it is quite an innovative approach, and one where we are engaging with the community and developing a whole range of partnerships in order to support people who are unemployed in our community and get them back into the work force.

That is in very strong contrast, however, to the way in which the Howard government has addressed these issues. We know that back in 1998 the Liberal Howard government closed the Commonwealth Employment Service and set up Employment National and, despite promises to the contrary that the company would not be sold, two years later it was. Since June 2003 we have had only private job network providers, which Australia's unemployed are required to register with in order to receive their benefits. The non-compliance with the system can result in having benefits ceased. That is not unreasonable if the compliance is reasonable. There are currently about 110 private sector for profit and not-for-profit job network members operating from more than 2 700 sites, but the Howard government's job network program is not working, and they have simply got it wrong. It claims to target disadvantaged job seekers but it does not. The Federal government continues to rely on a one size fits all strategy despite its failings, and it has been a dismal failure.

The complaints that I am hearing now in relation to mature aged job seekers are no different to some of those raised in the Productivity Commission's review of 2002. The review identified a 'lack of specialised assistance for older job seekers', and this is backed up by recent complaints to me. Nothing has been done in two years to address these issues. I will give the house a handful of quotes from submissions made to the Productivity Commission's review in June 2002, as follows:

- ... I have applied for many jobs—at no time did my Job Network Provider arrange any interviews, approach employers on my behalf, or do any other function which could be called Intensive Assistance.
- ... The only thing the Intensive Assistance staff member did was to require me to write a larger number of speculative applications than I was already writing and set me an unreasonable benchmark of job ads to be responded to each week.
- I found the experience utterly soul destroying. The staff member did not appear to have any counselling or support skills. . .
- I phoned my job network provider and told her . . . great job was advertised. I would really like to go for it. She replied, 'I'm sorry, we haven't got your resume.' 'Why not?', I asked. 'We lost it. . . could you do another one?'. It's five pages. She says, 'We have a book, you pick which wording you like and we will do it.' I received it three weeks later full of mis-spellings, full of nothing. They leave you with nothing. They strip you of your dignity and respect. You feel like nothing. You just don't feel human. . . You have to go back because the government will cut off your benefits. . . they punish you like little children. . .

These are mature-aged job seekers. The Democrats employment spokesman Senator John Cherry was reported in the *Human Resource Magazine* of April 2004 as saying:

The Howard government needs to acknowledge that mature-aged workers face serious age discrimination problems in the work force. The independent review of the job network in 2002 found the system was letting mature-aged workers down and clearly little has improved since then.

Clearly there is no doubt about that. A constituent of mine in Golden Grove recently complained to me that, despite having two degrees and many years' experience in the work force, he was required to attend sessions to learn how to prepare job applications and how to perform at an interview. This was of little value to him, as it would be to many more experienced people, but if they do not comply they risk losing benefits. He also said he often would be called in for an interview by his job network provider, who would invariably announce to him that there was really no need to call him in, 'just thought it was good to touch base'. Again, it was something that had to be done even though it was irrelevant.

My constituent said that this was more than just frustrating for him and a waste of time and resources but, importantly, impeded his genuine efforts to seek a job. He thought it would have been useful to have computers at his job network provider linked to the internet in order to enable him to access other programs such as seek.com.au or careerone.com.au, but this did not happen. There were only three computers and two did not work most of the time. Young people also are left out in the cold. My constituent found that he spent a considerable amount of time helping young people access information on computers or write resumes, and so on, because the staff were too busy to assist them.

When my constituent did find employment—which he informed me he did without any assistance from his job network provider—his job network provider continued to contact him for details about his employment months after he had commenced, even though his job network provider had played no role in securing his employment. He refused to provide details of his employment to his former job network provider, claiming that his employment had nothing to do with them. When he had achieved a position earlier—again with no assistance from his job network provider—he was asked to provide details. This resulted in the job network provider telephoning his employer to check on his attendance. He said that he believed this was not only an invasion of his privacy but also incredibly humiliating. I restate that the job network provider had no role in securing that position.

Of course, the job network provider wanted details in order to claim a fee from the Howard government, which, I might add, they get regardless of whether or not they are responsible for the placement.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Ms RANKINE:** Absolutely! As the minister said, it is an absolute rort. Clients like my constituent—mature aged, highly skilled, qualified, experienced and motivated to find employment—must appear as a blank cheque to a job network provider. The job network provider just goes through the motions with them, regardless of how relevant it is, and, if the individual finds a job of their own accord, the job network provider collects from the taxpayer just for being there.

The Department of Employment and Workplace Relations' own data shows that mature aged job seekers experience the worst employment outcomes following participation in every level of assistance delivered by the job network. Even after receiving the greatest level of assistance available under the job network—intensive assistance, now known as customised assistance—more than half mature aged job seekers remain unemployed. A third of Australians aged between 50 and 64 are on income support and nearly one in two Australians aged between 55 and 64 years are not in the labour force. It is a sad fact that under the Howard government too many mature aged job seekers in Australia are finding that, once they lose their job, they are likely to never regain employment.

The issues facing the mature aged job seeker are quite different to those facing a young unemployed person. Neither can be assisted properly by being treated the same. The federal government must recognise that job seekers need assistance that is targeted to their needs. What is the point in making people use resources they do not need while at the same time not providing useful resources for people who do need them? It just does not make sense. My comments are supported by Mr Patrick McClure, Chief Executive of Mission Australia and head of the second-biggest job network provider, when in June this year he called for an overhaul of how the system assists mature aged job seekers. Mr McClure also made the point that the job network's 'one size fits all' approach to assisting the unemployed fails to acknowledge the special needs of mature aged job seekers, arguing that the more personalised the service that is given the better the outcomes can be. Taxpayers should not be funding the Howard government's job network sham; it is a con and it is not fair. Our job seekers, particularly our mature aged job seekers, deserve much better than what the federal government has on offer.

This afternoon I also want to talk briefly about young people and their involvement in our community and, again, that is a focus for our state government. I was very concerned to learn that on 7 September, at its briefing committee meeting, the City of Tea Tree Gully council was presented with a Youth Advisory Committee review from consultants PKF. This review was called for when, at its meeting of 28 April 2004, the Tea Tree Gully council suspended the Youth Advisory Committee. This is one episode in a long and sorry story which I believe illustrates that the Tea Tree Gully council simply does not take issues relating to young people seriously enough, and it is this failure of the Tea Tree Gully council that is a significant contributor to many of the problems of the area that we have heard about in recent times.

I will look at three matters which will demonstrate the point I am making. First, I want to look at a range of reports

received by the council to show that the Tea Tree Gully council should understand that it has a significant issue around young people and the provision of services for them. Next, I want to trace the saga of the Golden Fields—that is, the district sports field and the Harpers Field site—to show that there has been a significant waste of money and a lack of clear thinking about the provision of facilities for young people by the Tea Tree Gully council. I will then look at the background to the suspension of the Youth Advisory Committee and examine the consultants' report to show that there seems to be lack of empathy towards young people by much of the Tea Tree Gully council.

ABS statistics from the 2001 census show that City of Tea Tree Gully has a total of 19 311 young people aged between 12 and 25 years living in its area. This represents slightly over 20 per cent of the total Tea Tree Gully population and I think at one stage we had, overall, the second-highest number of young people in our area. In fact, they are amongst the highest in the state. In fact, the *Leader Messenger* reported that in August 2002 Professor Andrew Beare of Flinders University 'predicted future demand for family and teenage services such as sports-fields'. This need for facilities for young people is also shown in the council's own reports. The Tea Tree Gully council 2003 community survey reports that more than half of the surveyed residents believe that there are 'gaps in the service/facilities program in the City of Tea Tree Gully for young people'. Gaps identified included entertainment options, a youth resource centre and drop-in centres. Ominously, almost 89 per cent of those surveyed did not know that council had a youth participation policy and 80 per cent were unaware of its youth advisory committee.

In research for the development of an alcohol management plan, as part of the application by the Tea Tree Gully council for renewal of the dry zone area at Golden Grove, a youth focus group concluded 'that the biggest problem was that younger people had limited things to do within Golden Grove as well as the rest of the city at night'. The report concludes:

It is evident that many of the problems surrounding antisocial behaviour within Golden Grove and the rest of Tea Tree Gully stem back to a lack of activities for younger people, particularly those under 18 years, to participate in.

Finally, one of the recommendations of the plan is that young people are engaged in developing programs and projects that seek to provide recreational and educational outcomes.

The City of Tea Tree Gully has a large number of young people, and the council needs to do something in relation to this issue. The council needs to do something to the Golden Fields district sports field. The City of Tea Tree Gully was gifted this very large parcel of land in the centre of the Golden Grove development to be used for recreational purposes. At first it was called the District Sports Field but it is now known as Golden Fields. It is a 20 hectare site in the heart of Golden Grove, and the simple fact is that the council has failed to develop this land adequately. Indeed, in recent times the only development that has occurred there is the provision of a skate park, which has opened up this site to young people in cars to get in and rip around late at night and tear up the area and cause nuisance.

Rather than develop the site, the council wanted to sell pieces of it. It wanted to put houses on the site; there is no doubt about that. The major sporting fields for the area are now going to be located at Harpers Field, some distance from the heart of Golden Grove and certainly away from the direct public transport links. This site was, in fact, originally earmarked for a waste transfer station. After spending

something like \$900 000 on site development works, that proposal was dumped because the council decided—or claimed it decided—on a different waste collection system. However, I am a bit more suspicious and cynical than that. I think the council has changed its mind because it is keen to have another housing development sited around that particular area, and I do not think the council was so keen on their waste recycling facility. Effectively, the council has wasted hundreds of thousands of ratepayers' dollars, and it is the young people of Golden Grove who will suffer for this bungle because this former dump has been turned into a sports field site.

As I have said, the major sporting field development is now on the eastern outskirts of the Golden Grove development instead of being in the centre of the development, as was originally envisaged in the Golden Grove development. That original proposal also included not just playing fields but also a community and sports club, so that young people would actually have a positive social environment in which to enjoy themselves and interact with other members of the community. If anyone were to sit down and say, 'Let's pick the worst possible site for a sports development in Golden Grove,' they would very likely pick the Harpers Field site.

However, worse is to come because this year council scrapped spending money which had been earmarked for the Golden Fields site. An amount of \$2.1 million had been earmarked for the site, but that has now been scrapped to compensate for the unbudgeted spending on other projects. Incredibly, that is not the worst of it because, so far, above and beyond the \$900 000 already wasted on Harpers Field being used as a dump site, the council has allocated another \$1.668 million for Harpers Field.

In summary, the council wasted money on a dump site; chose arguably the worst site for sporting fields development when it was given the best site (a 20-hectare site in Golden Grove); had the gall to try to sell parts of the best site for housing; and, finally, cut spending on this best site. The Golden Fields site, had it been developed properly and sensibly over a few years, would have provided a broad range of activities for young people in an ideal central location. Instead, we now have a fragmented hotchpotch of ad hoc developments. It is no wonder that young people are disillusioned; it is no wonder there is nothing to do; it is no wonder there are anti-social problems in our area.

I listened with some interest to the member for Enfield's presentation when he talked about frustration with local government and the provision of information to elected members, and sometimes I have to wonder how much information is passed on to the elected members of the Tea Tree Gully council. Certainly, in one of the reports, information was provided to members about how much was budgeted for Harpers Field and what was being spent. We looked at that particular document and contacted the council and asked whether that, in fact, included the money spent on the dump, and it did not. So, a report was put to the councillors. They have given information that the total capital costs for stage one would be \$1.668 million but that did not include the \$900 000 already spent on the site. So you really have to wonder about the information that is being provided.

Back in October 1999 I raised the issue with the Tea Tree Gully council of the need to have a youth officer and establish a youth advisory committee. The council took some deal of convincing, I can tell the house. It was until September 2001—so it took about two years to convince it that this

needed to be done. This was a much-needed initiative and one that I was very pleased the council undertook.

The committee operated in an interim capacity for only about 12 months and, in May 2003, due to the upcoming local government elections, the interim youth advisory committee was disbanded. From June to August 2003 the formation of the second youth advisory committee was advertised and, after selection of members, training sessions and informal meetings, the first youth advisory committee meeting was held in October 2003. After seven meetings the Tea Tree Gully council suspended the Youth Advisory Committee in April 2004.

What happened? What caused this suspension to take place? Put simply, I believe it is a result of the Tea Tree Gully council's not taking the concept of youth participation seriously enough. I commend to members the PKF consultants' Youth Advisory Committee Review. Like all reports, it is not just what is said but also what is not said that is important. I will confine my comments to what is said in the report, because that is damning enough. I will take a few points from the review to illustrate my point.

The interim Youth Advisory Committee had recommended that there be one elected member of council on the new Youth Advisory Council. Council overrode this and appointed two members. In one sense this may appear reasonable, except that only one elected member regularly attended meetings. To quote the report, it is no wonder that 'the YAC members interviewed indicated that this signified to them that youth needs and opinions did not matter.' The Tea Tree Gully council failed to provide adequate guidelines to the Youth Advisory Committee about its operations. The Youth Advisory Committee had believed that its job was to implement the youth participation policy. However, at an informal briefing prior to the formal meetings, information was provided on its role in advising council on the implementation of the policy.

It is little wonder that the report says that young members of the Youth Advisory Committee have a lack of understanding of the role of the Youth Advisory Committee at Tea Tree Gully and that the purpose of the Youth Advisory Committee is unclear. From the report it is abundantly clear that the role of elected members has played a very real part in the problems of the committee. The report stated that currently many of the young members of YAC feel that they are having the views of elected members forced upon them; and, if their views are divergent, they feel that they are not being given appropriate consideration, so they are not being presented to council. Not surprisingly, a number of the young Youth Advisory Committee members felt that the council was paying lip-service to youth needs and the Youth Advisory Committee because they felt that they were not able to have their say due to elected members vetoing discussion topics before they got to the recommendation stage.

Finally, the flow of information was a real issue, with a number of younger committee members feeling that the flow of information was just one way—from YAC to the council. In other words, they were not receiving any information from the council about issues that may concern young people. Although it is not in the report, I think the council's time frames are also an important issue that needs to be addressed. It took the Tea Tree Gully Council almost four years from the time of the commencement of the youth needs analysis to establish a formal Youth Advisory Committee. On the other hand, it took six months for them to suspend the Youth Advisory Committee.



How can a council believe that it is demonstrating a real commitment to youth issues when it takes four years to establish something and six months to suspend it; when it ignores key recommendations from it; when it fails to give clear directions; when elected members veto topics for discussion; and when there is not a two-way flow of information to what is supposed to be the key peak youth body at the council? This is not to say that the Tea Tree Gully Council has not done anything for the young people of the area but, as I said, it is not taking the issue seriously. It is clear, and has been for many years, that young people's needs have to be addressed because of the high proportion of young people in the area. Money needs to be committed in a sensible, planned and thorough manner; and young people need to be properly consulted.

The council now has at least three chances to adopt a new approach. It can start to put youth matters high on the priority list in preparation for its budget next year. Now that council has its consultants' report, it can develop some sort of new youth advisory forum in a speedy manner to which it can give its support and commitment, and listen to what it says about the needs of young people. The council is now considering its draft recreation management plan, which is currently out for public consultation and highlights the needs of young people. In that plan the needs of young people have been listed as priority number three—not priority number one or two, but priority number three—which can be up to a 10-year span. The council has to stop huffing and puffing and doing lots of tutting when it hears about things that are done in our community when they continue to sit on their hands and ignore the needs of young people.

I call on the City of Tea Tree Gully Council to take the issues relating to young people far more seriously and follow the good practice principles as outlined in the consultants' report of commitment and respect so that the young people of Tea Tree Gully feel that their ideas will be acted upon and that they get the consideration, commitment and respect that they deserve.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH** secured the adjournment of the debate.

*[Sitting suspended from 1 to 2 p.m.]*

### **HOLDFAST SHORES PROJECT**

A petition signed by 61 residents of South Australia, requesting the house to urge the government to reject the proposal for the development of stage 2B of the Holdfast Shores project on the Glenelg foreshore, which includes a residential apartment building on the site of the Glenelg Surf Life Saving Club, was presented by Dr McFetridge.

Petition received.

### **PAPERS TABLED**

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Deputy Speaker—

Members Annual Travel Report 2003-04

By the Premier (Hon. M.D. Rann)—

Government Board and Committees Information—Listing of Board and Committees (by Portfolio) as at 30 June 2004—Volumes 1, 2 and 3.

### **SUPER TRAWLER, *VERONICA***

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I rise in the interests of our fisheries, amid fears that they could be under threat from one of the largest fishing trawlers in the world called *Veronica*. The government is determined to avoid any plundering of our fishery from this renowned super trawler. We are talking of a 106 metre long trawler, with a crew of 50, that services three on-board processing factories and can store 5 000 tonnes of frozen fish. Its fishing capacity is enormous, thanks to a mid-water trawl net that I am told has a mouth that is more than 250 metres wide. It can scoop up huge quantities without being able to separate non-target species—shark, dolphins, whales and other marine mammals. The by-catch could be as great as 40 to 50 per cent in terms of the unintended consequences. That could devastate our fishery and it is feared it could be heading our way.

There have been suggestions that the Irish owner of *Veronica* has bought Australian fishing licences in association with an Australian company. We are led to believe that the super trawler is looking to target fish resources, particularly blue mackerel, in the Great Australian Bight. It wants to plunder the food source of our tuna—another valuable commodity to South Australia and its export drive. Understandably, South Australia's fishers are deeply disturbed as this ocean going vacuum cleaner could have a long-term impact on the sustainability of fisheries off our coastline.

I can inform honourable members that our Director of Fisheries has powers under the Fisheries Act 1982 to refuse to endorse a vessel on a licence. I am reassured that in considering such action he is required to look closely at matters affecting sustainability, optimal utilisation and equitable distribution of the fishing resource. I am confident that, if this super trawler poses any threat to our fisheries, we could expect the Director of Fisheries to exercise his power over state waters.

Let me make my own position clear: I do not want *Veronica* to be licensed for Australian waters, let alone for South Australian waters. That is why I am calling upon the federal government to take greater steps to protect the waters beyond South Australia's jurisdiction. The commonwealth has only placed a freeze on the nomination of new vessels in the commonwealth fishery until November. That is when the freeze runs out. I am sure no-one would accuse me of being cynical, but I want to see some proposed action that does more than just get through the federal election period. The federal government is avoiding its obligations to protect the entire nation's fisheries. I want to see action to ensure that this supertrawler cannot damage our precious resources, plunder our valuable commodities and threaten the livelihood of local fishermen beyond the federal election. It would be great if there could be a bipartisan commitment to ensure that the *Veronica* is not licensed to plunder our fisheries.

### **STOLEN VEHICLES**

**The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Minister for Transport):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. P.L. WHITE:** The state government is introducing a new system of checks on the identity of vehicles as part of a crackdown on the illegal motor vehicle trade.

Effective from 1 November this year, the new system will significantly improve the detection of stolen vehicles being resold in South Australia. An estimated 32 000 vehicles each year will undergo an inspection and their identity checked against a national stolen vehicle database before being registered. The checks will apply to vehicles brought in from interstate, written-off vehicles and vehicles being sold by dealers, and will save dealers time and money.

An extra five inspectors with specialist forensic training will use specially developed inspection facilities in Adelaide and regional areas to thoroughly examine vehicles on hoists. This new system will make it harder for those people who choose to break the law and then seek to profit from their crime. Criminals will find it harder to resell stolen cars that are disguised by using identifiers from wrecked vehicles, conning unsuspecting buyers.

A vehicle is a major purchase, and people want the confidence of knowing they are not unwittingly buying a stolen vehicle. These improvements are based on nationally agreed best practice procedures, developed in consultation with the National Motor Vehicle Theft Reduction Council. This measure will help to prevent organised criminal groups from taking advantage of different state laws and procedures to register disguised stolen vehicles. The new three-tiered system of checks consists of:

- a basic inspection conducted by an authorised motor vehicle dealer and checked by Transport SA against a national stolen vehicle database;
- a basic inspection completed by Transport SA vehicle identity inspectors and, in remote areas by SA Police; and
- a comprehensive inspection for suspect and previously written-off vehicles, completed by trained Transport SA vehicle identity inspectors.

#### NOTICE PAPER

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Before calling on questions without notice, I point out a clerical error in the *Notice Paper* in relation to notice of motion No. 2. It should be deleted.

### QUESTION TIME

#### MINISTERIAL CODE OF CONDUCT

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition):** Is the Minister for Youth confident that she has not breached the code of conduct in failing to follow up on information given to her last year by advocates for the victims of child abuse? The code states that a minister must use all reasonable endeavours to obtain all relevant information and facts.

**The Hon. S.W. KEY (Minister for Youth):** I am fairly confident that I have not knowingly breached the Ministerial Code of Conduct that our government very proudly introduced to ensure that we were clear of our responsibilities and that we would be as available—

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.W. KEY:** Without the details, member for Unley, it is a little difficult to know the specifics. However, I have never knowingly breached the code of conduct.

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** I have a supplementary question. Did the minister make commitments last year to further take evidence from child abuse advocates but failed to do so?

**The Hon. S.W. KEY:** As the Minister for Youth, I was not approached by child abuse advocates.

**The Hon. Dean Brown:** That is splitting hairs.

**The Hon. S.W. KEY:** It is not splitting hairs. He asked me as the Minister for Youth. How is that splitting hairs?

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Finniss is out of order.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Minister for Infrastructure is out of order.

#### WATER POLICY

**Mr RAU (Enfield):** My question is directed to the Premier. What impact will the Howard government's announcement this week on water policy have on South Australia's national competition payments?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier):** I thank the honourable member very much for his question, as I know of his strong interest in national competition policy. On Monday the Prime Minister announced the federal Liberal's water policy 'Securing Australia's Water Future'. In making this announcement, I am told that he did not actually mention the River Murray. He came to South Australia to make the historic water announcement but, apparently, there was no extra funding at all for the River Murray, which is, of course, one of the biggest water issues facing this state.

It was also revealed that the \$2 billion fund would come from the state's national competition payments. These payments are paid to the states and territories for continuing reform in competition practices in trade, retail and business and government business regulations—such as Sunday trading, for instance. These reforms continue to provide an indefinite tax revenue benefit to the commonwealth. In effect, it means that the money set aside for South Australia in the form of these payments will be diverted to pay for the federal Liberals' water policy.

The Prime Minister's announcement could mean that the money that South Australia had factored into its forward estimates will not be available, and that any control over where that money should be spent could be taken away. I am advised that the money we had planned on receiving was \$55.1 million in 2006-07 and \$56.4 million in 2007-08. We now face the situation that we could lose \$111.5 million in funding! I am told that that money could provide nearly 1 000 nurses for our public hospitals, it could give our schools nearly 700 extra teachers, or it could fund an extra 500 police on South Australia's streets. A basic premise of the national competition payments—

*Mr Scalzi interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Hartley is not answering the question, the Premier is.

*Mr Meier interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Goyder is not talking, either. The Premier is answering the question.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** A basic premise of the national competition payments was that all Australian governments should share in the economic growth and increased revenue due to these reforms, yet the federal Liberal government has made a unilateral decision to redirect these funds without consultation with South Australia or any other states, and without consideration of how it will impact on our budget and our ability to provide important services to the South Australian people. I am advised that the federal government has breached the terms of the National Competition Policy

Agreement to share the ongoing economic benefits with the states and territories.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Goyder and the leader will come to order.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** He talks about codes of conduct. What about the Leader of the Opposition's code of conduct when he sold ETSA against the wishes of the people of this state and then tried to agree to a nuclear waste dump in South Australia?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The Premier will resume his seat.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The house will come to order. I see that the member for Mawson wants to ask a question later. The member for Goyder has been flouting the rules and, occasionally, so has the Minister for Infrastructure. The Premier.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I am advised that the federal government has breached the terms of the National Competition Policy Agreement to share the ongoing benefits with the states and territories. Today I signed a joint letter (together with every other Premier) to Prime Minister Howard expressing my disappointment that his announcement has effectively ended the national water initiative. It is indeed a disappointment to me, after fighting so hard to broker the historic agreement for the River Murray and securing 500 gegalitres in extra flows at the last COAG meeting in June.

The decision by the Howard government has undermined the spirit of cooperation for which we fought and which we achieved at COAG. No other state has fought so hard for its water resources. We will continue to be at the forefront of implementing our own water policy initiatives to secure South Australia's water future. We are committed to saving the River Murray. We are committed to a national water initiative, but we have seen a piece of Nixonian sleight of hand which is taking away South Australia's money and then asking us to bid back for it.

Today, I am very happy to table the letter to the Prime Minister signed by Bob Carr, Premier of New South Wales; Steve Bracks, Premier of Victoria; Peter Beattie, Premier of Queensland; Geoff Gallop, Premier of Western Australia; John Stanhope, Chief Minister of the ACT; Clare Martin, Chief Minister of the Northern Territory; Paul Lennon, Premier of Tasmania and myself, as Premier of South Australia, saying that we want to work cooperatively. It makes no sense, after all that has been achieved in getting the rescue of the River Murray going to now effectively negate that cooperation. My appeal to the Prime Minister is, 'Let's co-operate together, rather than play dirty tricks in this political way.'

A very short time ago, Mark Latham, the Leader of the federal Opposition, announced his River Murray policy. In a comprehensive policy federal Labor has announced a number of initiatives. To improve water efficiency, a federal Labor government will create a new commonwealth corporation called Riverbank, a dedicated authority to ensure a long-term financial commitment to save the Murray.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Mr Deputy Speaker, the question from the member for Enfield was specifically about the effect of the federal government's policy and competition payments. Nowhere in the question was the question raised about the federal opposition's water policy—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Wind up and don't get into electioneering. The same applies to the opposition.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** It is interesting that the shadow minister does not want us to compare the much better deal that Mark Latham is offering South Australia in rescuing the River Murray.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Premier will come to order. If people are going to go out of the chamber, there will be more than one. We do not want anybody being lonely outside. That applies to the member for Goyder. Yesterday the chair said that the chamber should not become a platform for electioneering by the government or the opposition.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I rise on a point of order, sir. The Premier said that he had received advice. I ask him to table that advice.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The Premier has agreed to table—

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I am very happy to table the document I have in front of me. It is a news release entitled, '\$110 million of SA's competition money pays for Howard's water plan'. I am happy not only to table it, but also to read it. However, the key point is—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** It is interesting that—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The Premier will resume his seat. The Premier is defying the chair, and the chair will not tolerate anyone in here defying it.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** My point of order is—and we have had recent cases where this has been required—that, where a minister says that they have received certain advice, they can be asked to table that advice. Therefore, I ask the Premier to table that advice which earlier in his answer he said he had.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Premier has indicated that he does not have any written advice.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Has the Premier misled the house?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Just in finishing up, sir, the people who told the people of this state that they would never sell ETSA talking about misleading the house I find a bit rich. The functions of Riverbank will include investing in water infrastructure; joint venture arrangements with state governments; private sector water efficiency projects; and water supply improvement projects, including natural catchment management and revegetation projects. I can understand that members opposite do not like the fact that South Australia has won a great deal for the River Murray from Mark Latham today.

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** Sir—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The leader will resume his seat.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order, the member for Mawson!

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** When the house comes to order we might proceed. Unfortunately, the chair does not have a supply of Mogadon or Serapax. Members just need to calm down.

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition):**

I have an important supplementary question. From what the Premier said, does he have an ironclad guarantee from Mark Latham that competition payments would extend beyond 2005-06?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** What I have got from Mark Latham is an ironclad guarantee—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** No, listen. It appears that there is a blood pressure issue opposite—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order, the member for Mawson!

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** When the house comes to order we will resume. We do not have to have question time: we can go straight into the exciting Address in Reply. The house will come to order.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** When the house comes to order we will proceed. Does the Premier wish to conclude that answer?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** What I have is an ironclad guarantee of a partnership to rescue the River Murray and a partnership to save Medicare and more funding for our schools.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I have not called anyone yet. I am just waiting for the house to come to order. They are celebrating peace in Korea, but I do not think we are celebrating much here.

#### CHILD ABUSE

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition):** My question is again to the Minister for Youth. Is it correct that a number of people who were known to the minister last year, while she was the Minister for Youth, are suspected of inappropriate behaviour towards children in state care, continue in their positions with no investigations having been instigated by the minister? Yes or no?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Families and Communities):** Mr Speaker—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Before calling the minister, I should advise that people need to be very careful if any of this impinges in any way on a court case that could occur shortly.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** This question is about the government's responsibilities in relation to child protection, and I take responsibility in this house for answering questions about those matters. It does not matter which way this question is framed: we asked in this parliament yesterday that the honourable member supply us with details about what on earth he is talking about. He has been invited to do that—to supply the details of what he is on about. This is not an exercise of hide and seek: it is an exercise of clarifying what he wants to put to us, and we will supply the answers.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The leader is out of order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Newland is out of order.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** What we can say is that we have established a special investigations unit specifically charged with the responsibility of investigating allegations of abuse against children in care. All the cases that have been

brought to the attention of our department have been referred to that agency. If the honourable member has information that he believes ought to be followed up, he should bring that to the attention of the relevant authorities and it will be sent to the special investigations unit. As for the matter in question, we have invited him on a number of occasions to supply us with the details and we will be able to provide a detailed answer.

#### ECONOMIC OUTLOOK

**Mr O'BRIEN (Napier):** My question is to the Treasurer. What is the current economic outlook for business in South Australia?

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer):** I thank the member for Napier, who has a keen interest in matters economic. From an economic perspective, as with all perspectives in South Australia under this government, things have not been this good for decades. When it comes to business confidence, to jobs and to economic activity, this is an outstanding period of strong, consistent, sustained, quality, economic growth. That is under this Labor government: delivered by this Labor government. I was pleased to read the recent BankSA state monitor publication—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** Not delivered by me. No, you're right: the whole government has delivered strong economic growth. You're dead right: it is not just the Treasurer's role. The BankSA state monitor, the trends publication that BankSA brings out, is a very powerful message about the economic performance of this state. Under this government, what does the BankSA economic report say? It says that the overall business confidence index rose by 9.5 per cent between May and August 2004, lifting from 119.3 to 128.8, slightly below the historical high point of 132.7 in January 2004. Approximately 65 per cent of firms in South Australia are confident that the climate for doing business in South Australia will improve over the next 12 months—the highest result since the survey began in 1997.

Eighty-three per cent of businesses report feeling positive about their current trading situation, with the finance industry a stand-out, I am advised. The construction industry rebounded strongly from being one of the least confident sectors in the previous period to being one of the most optimistic in South Australia. Thirty-six per cent of businesses took on extra staff over the past three months, up from 30 per cent in the last survey. In the coming three months, 33 per cent of businesses indicate they are likely to take on extra staff, almost double the number in the previous survey. Confidence levels have risen significantly over the past three months off the back of an improved international outlook for the state's exporters. Businesses have also been buoyed by the continuing strong domestic economic conditions as shown by the healthy retail sales data.

This is an outstanding report that shows how strong our economy is and shows the optimistic feel about business in South Australia, and it demonstrates that with good, cohesive, united, strong government with the single purpose of improving the economic efficiency of South Australia, strong economic growth can flourish. Members on this side of the house can take credit for presiding over the best economic activity we have seen in this state for decades.

## CHILD ABUSE

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition):** Has the Minister for Families and Community asked the Minister for Youth for a briefing on any meeting she had with child abuse advocates where she was informed of any names of suspected child abusers and what action occurred?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Families and Communities):** Of course, in coming into the portfolio, I had detailed discussions with the former minister and all relevant information was handed over between the two ministers in that portfolio arrangement. I must say that it is with an air of unreality that I come into this forum and listen to this line of questioning. I was at a forum a few moments ago with about 80 foster carers and a number of them came up to me and said, 'Why is it that, when a patently false allegation is made against us from a child who has had a history of making false allegations, your department takes it so seriously, and so carefully carries out investigations to get to the bottom of that?' I explained to them, 'Well, we actually have a responsibility to ensure that we fully investigate each of these allegations because sadly some of them are true.' I come in here and hear the carping and nonsense of those opposite, people who do not appreciate the sensitivity of the investigations, understanding—

**Mrs REDMOND:** I wish to raise two points of order. One is the debating by the minister, and the other is that he is not answering the question that was asked, and relevance of the answer.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I do not believe that the minister has strayed all that far but he needs to get back to the precise matter.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** I make these two important points about investigations. First, false allegations are part and parcel, sadly, of this area—children who have been abused before, often with multiple placements. Sadly, some children know what it means to be able to get another placement. Let's be frank about this. Secondly, we also know—

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** I rise on a point of order. On relevance, the minister is talking about a totally different circumstance than what the question is about.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I think that the whole house is having difficulty understanding the precise intent of the question. I guess the answer will match the question.

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** If you could not understand it, I will repeat it. The question was—if people could not hear it because of the cackling along there—has the minister asked the Minister for Youth for a briefing on any meetings she had with child abuse advocates where she was informed of any names of suspected child abusers, and what action occurred?

*Ms Breuer interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Giles is out of order.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** The answer is highly relevant. I am explaining the nature of allegations in the child sexual abuse context, and the nature of an investigation that needs to be undertaken. The other important point to remember about these allegations is that, when they are traversed in the public sphere like this, and when details are revealed in the public sphere, they can tend to identify the children, and the families in question, to the serious harm of the welfare of those children.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** The standing orders do not allow the minister to stray to the extent that he is.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The minister needs to answer the specifics or end his answer.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** What I said at the outset is that I have received briefings on all relevant matters in relation to this portfolio. They include a myriad of child abuse allegations against foster parents that are presently seized and investigated by the Special Investigations Unit. Each of those are being investigated by the Special Investigations Unit. Without any further clarification in the questions from those opposite, it is impossible to know which of those allegations are being referred to.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Point of order, member for Unley.

**Mr BRINDAL:** On a point of order, I ask you, sir, to rule simply on relevance. The question looked at accusations not against foster carers but against the minister's own workers, and this is not a relevant answer. The minister's own workers!

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The minister has answered the point in regard to a range of briefings, but without more specific information I do not know whether he can say more.

## WARDS OF THE STATE

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition):** My question is to the Minister for Families and Communities. What investigations have been made to 'a certain' which records relating to wards of the state—

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** 'Ascertain' is the word you are looking for.

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** The nerd for words has just intervened. What investigations have been made to 'a certain' which records relating to wards of the state were destroyed, and has the government created a list—

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** 'A certain' what? 'A certain' something?

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** It is a serious issue and the Attorney-General, as would befit his office, is making light of a very serious issue.

*Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The leader has the call and not the member for West Torrens.

*The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Attorney-General is out of order. He can offer an English course after hours if he wishes.

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** What investigations have taken place to 'a certain' which records relating to wards of the state were destroyed, and has the government—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** This is a serious issue and people on the front bench do not see it as serious. They think child abuse is a joke.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** On a point of order, sir, it does not take me to point out how offensive that remark is. For his benefit, we are just laughing at his pronunciation of the word 'ascertain'.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** It would help if the Minister for Infrastructure did not interject.

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** What investigations have taken place to 'a certain' which records relating to wards of the state were destroyed, and has the government created a list of those whose records have been totally or partially destroyed? Following a question during estimates on 22 June relating to files of past wards of the state, the Adoption and

Family Information Service Manager confirmed that a number of private files have been destroyed.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Families and Communities):** I must invite the Leader of the Opposition to read the legislation that passed the parliament on the last day of the last session. I remind the Leader of the Opposition that, after he had asked that question in estimates, he was not satisfied with my providing an answer—he wanted to ensure—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** No, we have—we have answered it. But, he was not satisfied—

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** On a point of order, I cannot see the relevance at all of what the minister is saying.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I uphold the point of order. The question related to destroyed records. Maybe the minister could get to that specific point.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Could you allow me to develop the argument a little, sir? The investigation he is calling for, sir—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The minister has the call.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** The very investigation he is calling for to be undertaken was inserted into the terms of reference of the inquiry at the urging of the Leader of the Opposition. It was an amendment promoted by the Leader of the Opposition. Against my opposition and against my better instincts I thought I would answer that question in the parliament because he asked me in estimates. He said, ‘That is not good enough, we do not want your answer: we want an investigation by Commissioner Mullighan.’ That is what he will get. He comes into this parliament and wants us to have another go at it. It is absurd. Perhaps he should go back and look at the legislation he assisted in drafting. I do not know what has happened between the end of the last session and the beginning of this, but he seems to have forgotten about the legislation he assisted in putting through the parliament.

### CHILD ABUSE

**Mr BRINDAL (Unley):** My question is to the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. Given that the answer of the minister’s colleague today was that every and any accusation of abuse should be investigated, has she provided files about teachers accused of sexual misconduct with students to the Premier’s paedophilia task force and, if not, why not?

With the removal of prosecutions being made by this government, I have been made aware of a number of instances in which teachers accused of various forms of sexual misconduct in government schools were—in a fashion almost identical to those described in the Anglican Church’s report on abuse—simply transferred to other schools. I recently received a telephone call referring to a specific instance of allegations of sexual misconduct made against a teacher in a school in the Mid North, which resulted in nothing other than the teacher’s being transferred. In light of the Premier’s call to make the evidence of the Anglican Church available to the police, I ask whether this minister is doing the same for government teachers accused of the same sort of conduct?

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Minister for Police):** The extraordinary contribution the member for Unley makes from time to time cannot go unchallenged. If he is in receipt of information, he should make that information known to the

police immediately. I was part of a briefing involving caucus members, members from both sides of the house and the police when the member for Unley presented some material to me. I do not know what has happened to that material.

All I know is that the police in this state are charged and significantly resourced to investigate all serious issues relating to allegations of paedophilia—be they in the Anglican Church, the scout movement or the education system, private or public. Already in excess of 800 allegations have been recorded by SAPOL relating to sexual assaults allegedly committed prior to December 1982. In excess of 600 people have been nominated as persons of interest arising from the complaints recorded.

An extraordinarily large number of issues are coming forward and, as a government, we are ensuring that the police through the paedophilia task force have all the resources they need and request. I say this: no government in this state’s history has done more to protect the young in this state than this government. In my opinion, no government has put more resources right across government than this one. If members opposite can prove otherwise, they should come forward. Whether it be through the Layton inquiry, when we first came into government (a significant piece of public policy by the then minister for families and communities), or 200-plus new officers, unlike the last government, which tended to cover up issues—

*Mr Brokenshire interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Mawson!

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:**—and settle these matters, we want to bring issues to the fore and deal with them. If any member of this chamber has information regarding such activities of any member of the community, they should not hesitate to go directly to the paedophilia task force in this state for its immediate attention.

**Mrs REDMOND (Heysen):** Why has the Minister for Families and Communities reneged on his previous commitment to fully inform the house of the evaluation of the departmental role in the death of a baby at Victor Harbor?

On 26 May 2004, in answer to a question about whether FAYS had received notification about any of the babies whose deaths had been mentioned in an earlier ministerial statement, the minister stated:

I am more than happy to present to this house the information that I am as a matter of law allowed by legislation to provide to it, and I will certainly do so. I am anxious to ensure that this house is fully informed about these matters.

The minister further said:

I can make it absolutely clear to members of this place that, certainly, the behaviour of the previous government around these matters, where it refused to allow all relevant information to be before the house, will not be a policy that I adopt.

However, yesterday, when I asked the minister to detail the findings of the role of each government agency involved, his response was, ‘No, we will not be publishing such an evaluation.’

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Families and Communities):** The very passage that the honourable member read to the house explains exactly why I have not chosen to detail the personal circumstances of the individual case. It is because we are not permitted by legislation to do that. As a matter of policy, it would be wrong for us to disclose—

*The Hon. D.C. Kotz interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Newland will come to order.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** —any details of individual matters that tend to identify those who have been involved—

*The Hon. R.G. Kerin interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The leader will come to order.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** —in the administration of the Children's Protection Act. That is the public policy that is contained within that act. I have accounted to the house, and I think that the—

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Bragg is out of order.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** —Minister for Health has responded. My agency has responded that all appropriate steps were taken.

*Mr Williams interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for MacKillop is out of order. The member for Heysen.

**Mrs REDMOND:** Is the minister saying that he has received the evaluation and has received advice on what can be issued to the house and nothing can be issued to the house, or has he not received the evaluation or not received advice on what can be issued?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** I do not know how many questions were asked then, sir, but I can tell the house that I agreed to come back to the house and say what had happened with the various agencies and their role in the unfortunate death of this child—both agencies. I think that the Minister for Health responded to the house, and I have now responded to the house. We have conducted that evaluation on the individual case, and we have satisfied ourselves that the relevant steps were taken. That does not mean—

*Mrs Redmond interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** It may be that the public policy that is disclosed in the legislation does not suit members opposite. They might like to trawl through the individual circumstances of every step that the FAYS agency (as it then was) or the CYFS agency (as it now is) takes in relation to a child protection matter. They may wish to do that. They may also want to explain why that would be a good public policy idea; why that would actually be in the public interest. I think that the ideas that prevailed at the time when those restrictions were included in the act about disclosing the activities of the agency, if they would tend to disclose the personal circumstances, would also prevail.

We have put in place a Child Death and Serious Injury Review Panel, which will look into these matters and evaluate whether there has been some interface between agencies that have—

*Mrs Redmond interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Heysen has a point of order.

**Mrs REDMOND:** My point of order relates to the relevance to the question that was asked, which was about whether the minister had received an evaluation of the role of the departments and whether he had taken advice on whether information could be released to this house in accordance with what he promised.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I do not know whether the minister can add any more to that specific point.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Just to assist the member for Heysen, if she did not understand, I received the evaluation and reported to the house the outcome of that evaluation, as did the other relevant minister whose agency had some contact with that child. Members opposite might like to traverse in this house each individual case, or they might want to think, as a matter of public policy, what changes they might seek to promote to the legislative environment, or the way in which we conduct the agency that may assist in moving forward this public policy agenda.

We do not hear any of those ideas. We just hear low-level interest or participation in the Layton review. It is absent in the major public policy debates around child protection but it is always taking the opportunity to make a cheap point about the death of a child. We have set up the relevant bodies to evaluate. We have subjected ourselves to more scrutiny in this area than those opposite would ever dream of allowing themselves to be subjected to.

## OUTPATIENTS, COUNTRY

**Ms THOMPSON (Reynell):** My question is to the Minister for Health. Has the government changed the way in which general practitioners in the country are paid for providing medical services to outpatients at country hospitals?

**The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health):** I thank the honourable member for her question. As people would remember, this was raised yesterday by the member for Finnis when he said that a case on Kangaroo Island suggested that serious attempts are being made by the government to move health costs from the state to the commonwealth.

*The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:*

**The Hon. L. STEVENS:** I notice the member for Finnis immediately getting agitated.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. L. STEVENS:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I seek your protection so that I can at least be heard.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Finnis is flouting the rules of the house.

**The Hon. L. STEVENS:** The member for Finnis also told the house that I had failed to reply to a letter from Dr van der Linden from the Kangaroo Island Medical Clinic dated 28 June 2004. On both counts, the member for Finnis is wrong.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. L. STEVENS:** No; that would be your response. Dr van der Linden wrote to me on 28 June 2004 concerning access and payment for emergency services to rural residents in rural South Australia. On 11 August I replied to this letter with a two-page response. My letter invited Dr van der Linden and his partner at the Kangaroo Island Medical Clinic, Dr Rombout, to participate in a process currently underway to develop strategies and actions to improve country health outcomes, and referred them to documents that have been placed on the web to facilitate this process. Prior to this response, my office also arranged for the Executive Director of Country Health Services, Ms Roxanne Ramsay, to speak with Dr van der Linden's partner, Dr Alf Rombout, who had made representations to my office on the same issue.

There is no better authority on the way that doctors are paid for providing outpatient services to country hospitals than letters written by the former minister. One such letter to

his Liberal colleague, Mr Patrick Secker MP, dated 27 April 2000, states:

It is common practice throughout South Australia for general practitioners to provide medical services to the local public hospital as private practitioners. This arrangement has existed since the introduction of Medicare in 1976. Hence, in rural areas general practitioners are contracted to provide emergency services to the local public hospital, and regard those services as an extension of their private business.

The member for Finnis continues:

Accordingly, they charge the patient the fee for the service. Under this arrangement the patient can seek reimbursement of the scheduled fee for each service from Medicare.

The member for Finnis also explained in his letter to Mr Secker that it was the doctor's decision as to whether they bulk billed, and whether they charged a gap fee above the Medicare scheduled fee, and explained that these fee arrangements applied to outpatients only, and that there is no charge for public inpatients.

The files include many similar letters signed by the former minister. In one dated 11 September 2000, addressed to the Hon. Ron Roberts MLC, the member for Finnis explained as follows:

As you would be aware, it is extremely difficult to recruit medical practitioners to work in rural areas. Cooperation between hospitals and GPs is essential to maintain an adequate number of medical practitioners in each country town, and the provision of emergency service is a part of agreed arrangements between rural hospitals and local GPs.

These arrangements, supported by the previous minister, apply today. I will certainly ask my department to ensure that they were appropriate to the specific case quoted by the member for Finnis involving a person being airlifted prior to admission to the local hospital.

**Mr BRINDAL:** Sir, I rise on a point of order. Mr Speaker Lewis has ruled that it is a discourtesy—and I think he used the words 'a contempt'—of this house for a minister, under the guise of a question, to seek to further explain an answer to a question asked on a previous day. I contend that the minister clearly was answering a question asked yesterday by the member for Finnis. She wasted question time when she has other vehicles, and I ask you to refer the matter to Speaker Lewis.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I do not think that the question was the same as the one asked yesterday.

#### TRANSPORT SA

**Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson):** Is the Minister for Transport aware of allegations that senior management of motor registration have directed staff at the Oaklands Park Licensing Review Section to act illegally? A letter sent to the opposition advises that senior management have directed staff to illegally remove the licence disqualification of a client who became abusive when he was refused the good behaviour option to which he was not eligible. The letter also advises that senior management have overturned the decisions of road safety officers, directing them to reassess clients who have previously been tested as unfit to drive.

**The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Minister for Transport):** All I am aware of is what I read in the *Hansard* transcript of the member for Mawson's questions yesterday and the day before. On each occasion I asked him to hand over the alleged letter, which he said in the house yesterday was unsigned. So, he does not even know who it is from. No specific allegation

has been made. I ask him for a third time to hand over any allegations that he has. I am not aware of any—

**An honourable member:** It's your job to investigate.

**The Hon. P.L. WHITE:** Investigate what? Who is the person?

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. P.L. WHITE:** That is what I say—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. P.L. WHITE:** Hold on. He said that was one person, out of all the thousands of drivers in South Australia. Could he at least give me a hint who this was supposed to have been—which licence of which licence holder?

**Mr Brokenshire:** I can give you the names of the three people in the letter, yes.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P.L. WHITE:** Three days—and, might I add, running out into the media saying that there is trouble afoot, and for three days refusing to hand over any details. How can you investigate an instance when you cannot get any details of it? If the member will give me the details, I will make sure that it is investigated.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The house will come to order.

#### LINEAR PARK

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens):** My question is to the Minister for Planning and Urban Development. Which government approved the sale of the River Torrens Linear Park land at Underdale from public ownership?

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Morphett is out of order. And the Minister for Infrastructure—it is not unusual—is out of order as well.

**The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Minister for Urban Development and Planning):** I thank the honourable member for the question and the opportunity to clear up once and for all the matter of which government put a for sale sign on the River Torrens Linear Park at Underdale. I thought this matter had been resolved on Tuesday when the honourable Leader of the Opposition asked a question and I politely pointed out to him that it was his government that sold the River Torrens—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P.L. WHITE:** Here they go, refusing to take responsibility for the actions of the former (Liberal) government.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order, member for Bright! We are waiting to hear the answer from the minister. I am very interested in this answer.

**The Hon. P.L. WHITE:** It also gives me an opportunity to respond to the allegations made in this house by the member for Morphett on 14 September, after the question asked by the leader in a grievance debate, when he said:

The University of South Australia wanted to go into unconditional contracts; it wanted to sell off a whole lot of this land. If it had been the former Liberal cabinet examining this contract, it would have, of course, come down very heavily on the university and said, 'No, you will not be selling off the linear park.' The contracts had to be approved by the Governor, so they had to go to cabinet and then Executive Council. This Labor cabinet. . . would have approved the sale of the linear park to private developers.

I could not work out why they had got their facts so wrong, until the member for Morphett also gave us that response.



They got it from the Messenger newspaper. On 14 September, in the grievance debate the member for Morphett said in the grand finale, slam dunk proof of his case:

Sue Crafter from Urban Pacific, one of the developers who bought this land, is quoted as saying in *The Weekly Times Messenger* of 9 June 2004:

... the university received government's approval for the sale in 2001.

I understand that the Labor government came into power in early 2002. Ms Crafter goes on to say:

and this is the key part—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Morphett will be warned in a minute.

**The Hon. P.L. WHITE:** This is the key part—

... that required us going to the government of the day, getting their cabinet approval, and then the Governor.

The problem with the member for Morphett's case is that that cabinet approval came in the form of a submission made by the member for Light and approved by cabinet on 31 May 2001. And the Governor's approval, which the member for Mawson claimed—the member for Morphett claimed—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Mawson will think we have all got it in for him if we keep using the wrong title.

**The Hon. P.L. WHITE:** Sorry: I should have said 18 June 2001. The key approval by the Governor, which the member for Morphett said occurred under our watch, actually occurred on 11 October 2001.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** As a supplementary question, will the minister advise on what date the sales contract was signed?

**The Hon. P.L. WHITE:** The University of South Australia received permission from the government of South Australia to sell the Torrens linear park to whomever it pleased, and unconditional approval was given by the Liberal government in 2001. Subsequently, they entered into negotiations and they sold it earlier this year.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** We are waiting for the Minister for Infrastructure.

#### PUKATJA COMMUNITY

**Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett):** Has the Premier provided a written reply to the letter dated 30 May from the Pukatja Aboriginal community? Most people will be familiar with Pukatja by its former name Ernabella. The opposition has received a copy of a letter written to the Premier by the chief officer of the Pukatja community. Part of it reads as follows:

... When you visited the lands at the end of April we were looking forward to meeting you. I got council members ready for a meeting with you and we had the kettle boiling. When you didn't arrive, I drove across the creek to see where you were, and found you in front of the television cameras. Unfortunately I did not see you again.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier):** The member for Morphett is the one, when there were rumours that there might be a flood on the Patawalonga, and I was invited to the site, he was down there—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The Premier will resume his seat. Members will resume their seats. The house

will come to order. I have to congratulate the Speaker on picking a good time to visit Korea.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I rise on a point of order. The Premier strayed from the question. I think that we all noticed that.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I know that the honourable member does not want me to finish the story because it reflects on his behaviour appallingly, and he knows exactly what I am talking about. Members opposite should be aware. Let us talk about the issue—

**Mrs REDMOND:** I rise on a point of order. The answer thus far has gone nowhere near the question that was asked.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Premier has barely started. The kettle is still boiling.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Members know that the Leader of the Opposition was told that he had to become tough and nasty in order to retain his position and, so, every time the Premier is asked a question, everyone has to shout on this side. We know what the game plan was.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I rise on a point of order. The Premier seems to have strayed from the question.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I want to make it clear to everybody here that I do not care who is plotting, the Leader of the Opposition has got my strong support because this state needs stability, and that means stability in opposition as well. The member—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I think members would be advised to get the billy boiling and have a cuppa, and probably a Bex or two.

---

#### CHILD ABUSE

**Mr BRINDAL (Unley):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**Mr BRINDAL:** I asked a question today concerning a generality of whether teachers have been reported to the police force. I quoted one instance of which I am aware, and I have passed that information on to the police. I make the point that my question was not that I purported to know every instance, but that there were many instances and, I believe therefore, that the Deputy Premier tried to misrepresent my question by suggesting that I had more information than in fact I had. I have passed all information in my possession on to the police.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I point out that personal explanations are not for debate but are a reflection.

#### RING CYCLE

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** During his Address in Reply remarks yesterday the member for Unley sought clarification of the comment in the Governor's Deputy's speech that the forthcoming production of Wagner's *Ring* cycle is indeed the forthcoming production. The first production of the *Ring* cycle performed in South Australia in 1998 was an existing

production created by the Theatre Du Chatelet in Paris and imported to South Australia. This means that the scenery, costumes, lighting and other production elements of the opera were imported to Australia, accompanied by the original Theatre Du Chatelet production team, that is, the director, lighting designer, scenery designer and other technical personnel. The State Opera of South Australia did the casting for the opera so, while the 1998 *Ring* cycle was the first performance of this opera in Australia, it was a French production and not an Australian production.

The 2004 production of the *Ring* will be the second production of the opera performed in South Australia. However, it is the first ever Australian production of the *Ring*. That is what is so important about it and that is what the Hon. Diana Laidlaw was supporting, that is, it has been wholly cast and created (by a creative team-director, sets, costumes and casting) in Australia. That is what is meant when we say it will be the first Australian production of the *Ring* cycle. Including the forthcoming 2004 production there will have been only two productions of the *Ring* cycle performed in South Australia. In stating that there had already been two or three Australian productions of the *Ring* cycle, the member for Unley may be confused by the fact that the *Ring* comprises four separate operas: *Das Rheingold*, *Die Walkure*, *Siegfried* and *Gotterdammerung*. It is worth noting that the State Opera of South Australia is only the fourth company to create a new production of the *Ring* cycle in its entirety and premiere it in one season since the work was created by Wagner in 1876.

#### POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

**Mr CAICA (Colton):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Will the house come to order? Those who do not wish to be in here, please go elsewhere.

**Mr CAICA:** On 30 June, in a contribution by the member for Morphett in relation to the Fire and Emergency Services Bill, it was asserted by him that I had received \$110 000 as a contribution by the United Firefighters Union as part of my campaign for election to this house. Despite my alerting the house on 21 July to the fact that this comment was not based on fact, was untruthful and misleading, and despite my providing the opportunity for the member for Morphett to come back to the house and correct that position, he has failed to do so. To correct the record, because the member for Morphett is not willing to do so, I did not receive, despite the fact that I would have liked to, \$110 000 from the United Firefighters Union of South Australia.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I do not know what has got into the drinking water, but the member for Heysen has the call.

#### GRIEVANCE DEBATE

##### GENDER BIAS

**Mrs REDMOND (Heysen):** I rise today to grieve on an issue dear to my heart and I am sure that a number of members here are aware that it is dear to my heart. A number of constituents have raised with me the level of bias in this government exhibited in favour of women, at least in the

perception of a number of my constituents, against men. I have had an email about it from a male constituent pointing out that males have a higher mortality rate, a lower life expectancy, higher death rates across all but one of the 10 leading causes of death, higher suicides rates, higher drug, alcohol and tobacco use, receive less health funding and have a lack of preventive and screening services and a lower use of health services. They are much more likely to be the victims of violent assault, more likely to be homeless and often are falling behind in the education system.

In fact, even in the Opening Speech I notice that a special new service has been created under the heading of Children, Youth and Women's Health Services. Of course, we are all aware that this government has the Women's Information Switchboard and a Minister for the Status of Women, and so on. I have made—

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** Not just this government but previous governments. It is about 30 years old.

**Mrs REDMOND:** That is right, and I accept the Attorney's assertion that that office has existed not just under this government. Members would be aware that I have risen on many occasions in this house to object to legislation providing that there be any sort of gender discrimination within our legislation and that our legislation should typically provide that there be at least one male and one female on every board. In fact, I understand that the government may be moving to a requirement that half the members of boards it appoints be of the female gender.

The email sent to me also included an indication of two particular items about which the person contacting me was upset. In *The Advertiser* on 1 July, the Department of Human Services placed an advertisement entitled 'We're changing.' It stated that it was establishing a new Department for Families and Communities to focus on child protection, housing, ageing, disability, Aboriginal affairs, women and youth. Noticeably absent was a reference to men. My email correspondent also alerted me to the fact that on 12 August the Minister for Families and Communities granted some \$2 million to shelters for women and children, but my correspondent was under the impression that men needed shelters as well.

As I said, my general views are not the reason I raise this issue today. I do so because of something I observed on Tuesday as I left the building to watch the bands prior to the commencement of the opening of this session. A member of this house pinched another member of parliament on the buttocks. Had it been a male member of parliament, he would have been pilloried for that sort of behaviour and, in all probability, thrown out of the house. Furthermore, when the person assaulted in this way objected, he was scoffed at by the assaulting member of parliament. It seems that the member for Norwood is allowed to pinch people on the bottom, even though male members of parliament cannot not behave in this way.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** Grow up!

**Mrs REDMOND:** The honourable member may scoff, but I find it extremely demeaning to my gender for anyone to behave in this way. I would have expected the Premier to call the member to order for her behaviour, which has been notorious in this place, and I know that the member for Mitchell has objected to it in quite a physical way. However, to scoff at someone asking to be left alone is just outrageous. My view is that the Premier has his own reasons for not calling her to order. I know that he covets her seat of Norwood and has no interest, therefore, in calling her to order

and making her behave in a proper manner. But it is entirely inappropriate and demeaning to my gender and to all members of this house to allow any member to behave in this manner towards any other member of the house or the public. This member needs to be called to account.

Time expired.

### CHILD ABUSE

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens):** I cannot believe how low some members will go. Thankfully, I will lift the tone of this debate. At lunchtime, I went home to collect my mail. Because we are in the middle of a federal election campaign, I like to see what is being distributed in the electorate of Adelaide. I received Trish Worth's newsletter, and I was horrified—

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** Funded by the taxpayer.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Funded by the taxpayer—to see on the front page Trish Worth sitting at her desk in Canberra with the Prime Minister (this photograph was obviously taken recently), and on her desk was a photograph of herself, the former governor-general Peter Hollingworth and the former archbishop of Adelaide Ian George.

Trish Worth, whether or not we like it, represents the people of Adelaide, and there are people within the electorate of Adelaide who have been the victims of child abuse, and people who have been victims of child abuse within the Anglican Church. Ms Worth has on her desk a framed photograph of herself with the former governor-general who was forced to resign his position and a former archbishop of South Australia who was forced to resign his position. Not only did the Treasurer call on her to resign but also the opposition supported that call. What does this say to the victims who suffered as a result of the cover-ups of Ian George?

*Mr Scalzi interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Hartley is out of order.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** I think that Trish Worth has shown a level of insensitivity that I cannot believe of any politician. Not only is it bad politics—

*Mr Meier interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Goyder is out of order.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** —but it is insensitive, and I am outraged. I am sure that Trish Worth will have an explanation for this. Obviously, she is very close friends with Ian George and Peter Hollingworth, but I am not sure what kind of message she is sending to the people of Adelaide. I wonder how the Prime Minister will react when he realises who is depicted in the framed photograph on her desk. This is not a case of her being photographed with them. She has had her photograph taken with them and had it framed to put on her desk. What message does this send to the victims who have suffered? I think that Trish Worth—

*Mr Meier interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Goyder will come to order.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** —has let down the people of Adelaide, and she has let them down for the last time.

### PORT ADELAIDE INFRASTRUCTURE

**Mr VENNING (Schubert):** I want to raise a very serious matter today, namely, what is happening re the Outer

Harbor/Port Adelaide development? On Tuesday when opening the parliament, the Lieutenant-Governor said:

The immediate infrastructure priorities are at Port Adelaide and Outer Harbor and the new Adelaide Airport terminal. TransAdelaide will carry out its largest capital works program for many years.

This is the second opening speech we have heard containing the same comment. What is happening down there? Nothing. I see that it is the highest priority, but the government is mirroring only what the Economic Development Board has already said, which is that we need to have a new export-efficient port. This government has now been in office for nearly three years, but all we get is talk. I note that the roadworks are continuing very well (extending the South Road down to Port Adelaide), but a decision on the bridges is yet to be made and there is no sign of it.

This is now reaching a crisis point, and the future of South Australia having its own efficient export port is at stake. We know that it is vital that our new port is upgraded and deepened to handle larger ships, and that it is up and running before a new port of Melbourne is up and running. The previous Liberal government made the decision that Outer Harbor was the best option and it began the process. We had an 18 month to two year jump on the port of Melbourne. We had the expectation that Adelaide should be open for business at least one year ahead of the port of Melbourne in 2005-06.

The Victorian government is working overtime, and developers are flat out developing a new port of Melbourne. At best they are probably now only six months behind us, and that is if we got going now. But what have we done and what are we doing? Nothing. We seem to prevaricate, trying to placate the electors of Port Adelaide, but on-site nothing is happening. We cannot even decide whether we will have a fixed or lifting bridge. I understand that tenders are in and that the cost of the lifting bridge is way over the budgetary expectation and is out of sight.

Also, I understand that many tenderers are non-conforming. In other words, the project is so expensive that the tenderers are suggesting an alternative to that for which they have been asked to price. Is one of the alternatives, I ask the government, a raised fixed bridge—in other words, a fixed bridge that is built high enough but still giving reasonable access to the rail?

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** What do you want?

**Mr VENNING:** A fixed bridge, instantly! Now!

*The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:*

**Mr VENNING:** I do. Now! Absolutely! On the record, not an opening bridge. No! We cannot afford it, nor can the state. You cannot afford that bridge, and this delay is going to cost us wholesale. More and more delays. I am very concerned that we seem to be bogged down with this decision. These delays are causing much disquiet, especially for those vitally dependent on having a competitive export port. You only need to read what Mr De Crespigny has to say about this (your own chairman of your own Economic Development Board). Here you are; you are doing nothing. What is happening? I will bring you up-to-date, sir. Listen to this. Now we know that, after the merger, the Australian Barley Board (ABB Grain), which is a South Australian iconic company which will always have its head office here, will be one of our largest companies and will acquire a 50 per cent interest in the port of Melbourne.

What does it tell you? Have we lost this race? Is it a lost cause? Is it a done deal? Is Port Adelaide destined to become a minor port at the head of the Port River—totally bypassed by all but the smallest of ships? That is what you are going

to have, because we know that the Patricks are here, right now, looking for clients. The Minister for Transport said in this house that the government is considering standardising the Barossa line, which I have been pushing strongly for passenger trains. Great news, sir, but, think about it; what does it mean? It means much of the wine is going to go onto the railway line, not out through the port of Adelaide but through the port of Melbourne.

We already know of the plans to build a new intermodal rail depot on line at Edinburgh. But, sir, the traffic will be going the other way. I think it is grossly unfair to Flinders Ports in South Australia, which has bought our port. While we muck with this decision, we do not seem to be getting anywhere at all. Certainly, I can see the time when we will circumvent the Adelaide Hills with a railway line going backwards through the Barossa, Angaston, Cambrai, Sedan, Tailem Bend, raise the Footscray Bridge, and there you will have an express railway line all the way to Port Melbourne. That is what is going to happen, and while you muck with this, you are going to saddle South Australia with the greatest inequity, like the then government did with the MATS plan. I believe the loss of the MATS plan was a greater loss than the State Bank, because it has saddled Adelaide with choking traffic forever, and there is nothing the government can do about it, and there nothing that we can do about it.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr VENNING:** You are just about to do it again with this. You are handing over to Victoria. We may as well all take up Victorian citizenship, because that is where all our business is going to be done. We will do it out through the port of Melbourne and the port of Portland. It is a disgrace. Time expired.

### DEBT COLLECTORS

**Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens):** Yesterday, I was speaking with one of my constituents who was extremely upset over the tactics and behaviour of an agent of a debt collection agency. My constituent incurred debt quite some time ago and, due to some extenuating circumstances, has not been able to service that debt at this time. This debt collection agency has, one can only assume, either bought the debt or has been contracted by the company to whom the debt is owed to collect these moneys. While I personally have some concerns about on-selling debt, I know that companies have a right to collect money that is legitimately owed to them through any legal means available to them. Although, as I said, on-selling is certainly not something that I really support. I think that this case might highlight why.

The debt collection agency is entitled to collect the debt, but it is not entitled to breach the privacy of clients. The agent of this particular debt collection agency, in his eagerness to pursue the client, went to most extraordinary lengths in his quest. So eager was this fellow, he obviously had bought *White Pages* on disk, or whatever—

*An honourable member:* Online.

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** —online—and checked the street numbers. My constituent did not have a fixed phone line service at this time, so he obviously pursued it through the address, picked up a number that was close to where my constituent was living and rang the neighbour. He said to the neighbour, ‘Do you live next door, or nearby, to so and so?’ and, when he had established that, he provided to the neighbour information about his client—that, in fact, they had a debt and he was about to collect his debt. The neighbour

was extremely angry about being involved in this—and, of course, one does not need to know private things about one’s neighbours. The client is extremely embarrassed and, rightly, angry.

The client would have been very happy to speak to the agency had the agency written to them and said, ‘Please ring this number.’ I rang the number that was provided to the neighbour to give to the client. The answering machine did not disclose the company; it just said, ‘You have rung us and we are not here.’ I rang again and, eventually, I reached the fellow who had breached my constituent’s privacy. However, I had to ask him, ‘What is the name of your debt collection agency?’ and finally he gave it to me.

I have looked at the national Privacy Act and, clearly, he has breached the act. The act states that, with respect to an individual who is in debt and is being pursued for recovery to a third party, the debt collection agency is in breach of section 2.1 of the national privacy principles (and I have a copy of those) in disclosing information. Sections 2.1 to 2.6 are subject to a number of qualifications. However, in the particular circumstances, none of the qualifications apply to what has happened to my constituent and, as such, it states that an organisation must not disclose personal information about an individual that an agency holds. In this case, they have a debt of my constituent. In disclosing that information, the company is in breach as a result of its agent’s actions. I am certainly encouraging my constituent to write down the details of this matter. We do not want to involve the neighbour, because that would cause further embarrassment, but we will be taking this further and ensuring that this agency does not allow its agents to behave in this way again. I suggest that it is a timely reminder to anyone in this position not to breach people’s rights.

### SCHOOLS, BUS SERVICES

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart):** I want to raise the issue of bureaucracy wanting to take away facilities from people in country areas. It never ceases to amaze me why individuals are hell-bent on taking things away from small rural communities. I have received a letter from the Spalding Primary School, which states:

This letter is in response to a visit from Byron Carr from DECS Transport Unit. He indicated that he is once again looking to cut the school’s bus route. He has reduced the school’s bus route twice in the past two years. These two reductions to the bus route have resulted in the loss of students (present and potential) to the school. Currently, there are 10 students travelling to school on the bus. By cutting the bus route again, further students will be lost from Spalding Primary School. This will also impact on future students enrolling at our school. If the section of the bus route that Byron Carr is looking at cutting next year is axed, then it will mean two less students on the bus. As the ‘magic number’ to maintain a school bus is 10 children, then this will probably mean that the school will lose the bus entirely and those families using the bus service.

There are a number of young couples living in rural residences who would send their children to Spalding Primary School if the bus service is maintained as it is. In fact, if the bus route from 2003 had been maintained, there would be the possibility of 10 more students for the school. If the bus is lost, it will impact on employment for people living in the town. It would also possibly impact on one of the local stations being able to attract employees. They currently provide employment for four married couples. We strongly believe that if the bus route is cut once again (three times in three years), it will not only impact on the loss of families from Spalding Primary School but will have serious repercussions on businesses and local services in Spalding. The indiscriminate cutting of the bus route is detrimental to Spalding Primary School’s future. Please help us maintain our school bus service, our school and our town.

It is signed by David Bruce, Governing Council Chairperson. It is a perfectly reasonable request, and I ask the minister to take immediate action to tell Mr Carr and his ilk to go to Mount Gambier or up the Riverland and start taking school buses away up there. I suggest they go to Mount Gambier and try, and see what happens, or go up to Barmera. We all know what the result will be: they would not be seen again! I suggest that the minister finds somewhere suitable for Mr Carr—but it is not in my constituency. I intend to pursue Mr Carr and other bureaucrats of this nature until some commonsense applies. We have already had bureaucrats wanting to cut the health budget in my constituency by 3 per cent. The state bureaucrats do not want the hospitals to apply for federal funding to put in more aged care because the state has to make a contribution; they have taken away the road gangs from my electorate; but they have not cut the money for the paid Labor Party government office in Port Augusta. There is plenty of money for that.

I ask the minister, as a fair and reasonable person—and I have found her to be a fair and reasonable person in my dealing with her; I have no complaint about my personal dealings with the minister—to intervene to ensure that these families, these small communities, are fairly treated. Surely the maintenance of one school bus when we have 500 school buses in South Australia is not something unique, something excessive or unreasonable. But it is an essential service. If you downgrade the school, you cause it to close, then you destroy the heart of that rural community. I appeal to the minister and the government to be fair and reasonable. I am most disappointed that this letter has had to be sent to me, because these are good, hard working people in these communities.

They do not ask for a lot: they obviously get a lot less. I will give the minister reasonable time, otherwise I will make sure that all the people in the north of South Australia are aware of this, because I will make sure that Mr Carr is all over the TV.

Time expired.

### POLITICAL STUDIES

**Mr CAICA (Colton):** Last week I was invited by Clem McIntyre from the University of Adelaide to address a group of politics students in this chamber. Mr McIntyre is a man well known to the members of the house. He heads up the political faculty at the University of Adelaide and organises the political internship program. In my third year I am happy to say that I have my third intern and enjoy that program very much. He is also a member of the Committee of Experts connected to the Constitutional Convention. Along with you, Mr Deputy Speaker, the Hon. Kate Reynolds from the other place and a representative from the Liberal Party, we spoke to approximately 100 young people, who included politics students and other students, on various matters relating to parliamentary reform.

Most speakers, I guess it is safe to say, looked at the two areas of parliamentary reform. I will call one area peripheral, although it might not be the right word, but that is specifically looking at the standing orders of the place and things that can be done immediately to make this place function a lot more effectively.

The other side is the big picture issue relating to elections, upper house restructure, committees, and so on. I have not yet completed my third year in this place and on Tuesday I participated in my third opening of parliament. Whilst not

wanting to rain on anyone's parade, I enjoyed the colour and the excitement and the euphoria of the opening of parliament and, indeed, the 21-gun salute, but quite frankly I cannot see the purpose of it. We have parliamentary staff in a frenzy making sure that everything is organised. We have hundreds of people making sure that the day is properly organised (and not to say that that is not gainful employment for them) but I am sure that there are other responsibilities that they could undertake that might be far more beneficial to the state of South Australia than the opening of a parliament in the third year of this particular parliament's term.

I am not quite sure how much it costs but in colloquial terms it is WOTAM—a waste of time and money. To see the clerks and the table officers in their white gloves and little white bow ties is something to behold, but I am not sure that it is necessary. It got me thinking in relation to parliamentary reform, 'Why on earth are we doing this?' It is, in my view, a waste of time and a waste of money, and I am interested to know how much it costs. If we say that these people are not using their time as effectively as they might be, that is, the people who are charged with the responsibility of organising this august event, you only have to look at what we do as a result of another opening of parliament—the tedious process of Address in Reply. I know that you, sir, refer to estimates as a near-death experience. Well, Address in Reply is akin to having your teeth extracted, and it is not pleasurable. I think that we could use our time a lot more effectively than the necessity to prorogue parliament and go through this rigmarole once again.

Compared with other states, we are the only parliament in Australia today that prorogues and then goes through a full opening of parliament. If we look at Tasmania, New South Wales and Victoria, they only have one ceremonial opening per term and that tends, I think, to make better and more effective use of the time that they have available. If we use an analogy (and I am not renowned for my analogies), it is like Port Power playing St Kilda this Friday night—and in true South Australian spirit I say, 'Go Power'—but it is like having a national anthem at the commencement of every quarter, or having Port or St Kilda run through a banner at the start of every quarter—absolutely ridiculous.

The proroguing of parliament and the ceremonial circumstances that we had to go through the other day are not a sensible use of our time. It is probably going to be all next week through Address in Reply before we get on to any sensible business. I am not sure that it is a good aspect of our operations. I suggest that the standing orders committee that met previously reconvene, and I would urge the house to reconvene that committee to look at South Australia coming in line with other states, and cease what is now an archaic feature of this parliament, that is, the proroguing of parliament and the ceremonial opening of parliament after that.

---

### ADELAIDE DOLPHIN SANCTUARY BILL

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation)** obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to establish a sanctuary to protect the dolphin population of the Port Adelaide River estuary and Barker Inlet and its natural habitat; to provide for the protection and enhancement of the Port Adelaide River estuary and Barker Inlet; to amend

the Aquaculture Act 2001, the Coast Protection Act 1972, the Development Act 1993, the Environment Protection Act 1993, the Fisheries Act 1982, the Harbors and Navigation Act 1993, the Historic Shipwrecks Act 1981, the Mining Act 1971, the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972, the Native Vegetation Act 1991 and the Petroleum Act 2000; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to insert the second reading explanation in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Today I am very pleased to introduce to this place the *Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary Bill 2004*. Increasing protection for the dolphins living in the Port Adelaide River and Barker Inlet area is an important step in the Government's innovative program to provide for the long term preservation of South Australia's diverse and significant marine environment.

Over the next several years the Government looks forward to introducing additional measures to strengthen the protection of the marine environment. The Department for Environment and Heritage is currently developing initiatives to:

- establish marine protected areas; and
- implement a marine planning system which will provide the community and industry with the necessary guidance for the ecologically sustainable use and development of the marine environment; and
- provide broad integration of South Australia's marine and coastal management through new and innovative legislation.

The purpose of this measure is to protect the dolphins and their habitat within the Port Adelaide River and Barker Inlet area. This protection will be achieved by establishing the means to integrate the management of this area utilising a meaningful environmental reference. Management integration is necessary because of the complex, interrelated activities in the Port district. A range of state and local government agencies, industries, and community users all conduct operations in the area. While these operations may be well managed individually, to date there has been no mechanism to evaluate, manage and regulate the cumulative effect of the combination of them all to ensure planning efficiency and the ecological sustainability of the region. While a specific activity may be sustainable on its own, combining that activity with those in other sectors may mean the ecosystem is over burdened and resources are inequitably allocated.

The Port Adelaide River and Barker Inlet area is very important to South Australia. It supports a broad range of activities and this diversity sometimes results in conflicting operational requirements. Economically, the area is home to billions of dollars worth of assets with industries such as Penrice, Adelaide Brighton Cement, Australian Submarine Corporation, Flinders Ports and major power companies operating in the area. These industries provide significant capital and jobs to the State's economy. In the future, plans are in place to dredge at Outer Harbor, develop the freight corridor for rail, and expand the roadways with the Port River Expressway Project, making the Port a true international gateway for trade and tourism. The planning process for the proposed Port Adelaide Redevelopment Project is also continuing with a potential expenditure of \$900 million in construction work and up to 2000 on site jobs created.

The region is renowned for its Aboriginal and European heritage significance. Kaurna people lived in the area for thousands of years before European settlement and tours are available to take people to see connections still existing to this traditional way of life. Port Adelaide was settled by Europeans in 1840 and is now the state's first heritage listed precinct, proclaimed in 1982, and is also home to the largest and most diverse ships' graveyard in Australia. Along with these heritage values, this region is a place many people today value for recreational activities including fishing, boating and bird watching.

Environmentally, this area is a highly significant nursery and breeding area for a number of species, including King George whiting, garfish, bream, mulloway and also blue swimmer crabs and western king prawns. These species are valuable both as part of this ecosystem and also to the state's economy both commercially and for the recreational fishing industry.

The Port Adelaide River mouth and Penrice salt fields have been identified as areas of international importance for shorebirds. The Barker Inlet is one of the few remaining functioning estuaries located within a major city precinct in Australia.

Finally, of course, the Port Adelaide River and Barker Inlet is home to a resident population of dolphins. It is estimated that 20 to 30 dolphins are consistently seen in the Port Adelaide River and Barker Inlet area and over 300 more have been identified as visitors. Although dolphins are regularly seen all along the greater Adelaide metropolitan coast, Port Adelaide is one of the few places in the world where bottlenose dolphins appear to live in such close proximity to a major city and its associated activities.

The intent of the *Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary Bill 2004* is not to create new regulatory requirements for the area. Rather, it is intended that the Bill will provide focus and specific purpose for the enforcement of existing legislative requirements. Cooperation between State Government agencies, local councils, industries and community members will be the key to making the Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary a success.

Land tenure within the Sanctuary will not be altered. Existing tenures and uses such as mining leases, parks, and harbour and sea bed management will not be affected. The Sanctuary Minister will be responsible for the coordination of activities, but will not take on the responsibility of ownership of land or the seabed.

#### **Seven strategies for implementation**

Seven key strategies will underpin the implementation of this legislation.

First, the Bill specifies clear objects and objectives to ensure that the goals of the Act can be transparently understood and achieved.

Second, 11 existing Acts fundamental to activities in the Port Adelaide River and Barker Inlet environment are proposed for amendment. These amendments will require the respective Acts to have regard to or seek to further the objects and objectives of the Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary when making decisions about activities which will impact on the Sanctuary. The Ministers responsible for the administration of these Acts will be required to undertake appropriate degrees of consultation with the Sanctuary Minister when administering these relevant operations.

The Acts proposed for amendment are:

- the *Aquaculture Act 2001*
- the *Coast Protection Act 1972*
- the *Development Act 1993*
- the *Environment Protection Act 1993*
- the *Fisheries Act 1982*
- the *Harbors and Navigation Act 1993*
- the *Historic Shipwrecks Act 1981*
- the *Mining Act 1971*
- the *National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972*
- the *Native Vegetation Act 1991*
- the *Petroleum Act 2000*.

Third, the Bill proposes two avenues for planning clarity and accountability. A Management Plan will be required within a year of proclamation of this measure. The Plan will establish priorities for Government actions and detail targets of activity for agencies. This Plan will be supported by an annual implementation program which will be a part of the Sanctuary Minister's annual report to Parliament. Both of these planning mechanisms will ensure that Sanctuary planning is accessible and accountable to members of the wider community.

The fourth strategy of the Bill is to establish an Advisory Board to provide the Sanctuary Minister with expert advice on the implementation and assessment of these plans.

The fifth strategy provides for the establishment of a fund to receive monies to assist the Minister for the Sanctuary to further the objects and objectives of the legislation.

The sixth strategy is to create a general duty of care as a safety net to catch any activities harmful to dolphins or their habitat that may not be covered by existing legislation. The amendments to the *Fisheries Act 1982* and the *National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972* will provide still more protection for the physical well being of the dolphins.

Finally, the Bill will require the Sanctuary Minister to work broadly within the community to recognise and respect existing users of this environment, while utilising the community's strong commitment and interest in dolphins to educate and promote the protection of these animals and their habitat.

#### **Specific features of the Bill**

##### **Integration of Government agencies' actions**

Integration of the administration of the range of Acts relevant to the area is essential for successful management of the Sanctuary. The Bill recognises the significance of this integration and addresses it in clause 6(2) (Act binds the Crown) clause 9 (Administration of the Act to achieve objects and objectives), clause 25(d) (Functions and powers of Minister) and in the amendments to the related Acts.

#### **Objects and objectives (clauses 7 and 8)**

The objects and objectives are fundamental to the functioning of this legislation. Through amendments to the relevant Acts, they are the principal means of making the administration of all these Acts consistent. They also define the aims for the Sanctuary and provide a base on which to measure performance.

As a result of public consultation, some changes have been made to the objects and the objectives; however, the fundamental aim remains the same – to protect the dolphins and their habitat. Refinements have been made to make the objects and objectives more specific to dolphins and more connected to the functions and duties of the Minister as set out in clause 25.

#### **Management Plan (clause 11)**

The Management Plan will describe the overall strategy for the Sanctuary by defining key issues requiring attention, identifying those specific Government agencies with responsibility for these issues, and establishing targets for implementing remedies. The Plan is to be reviewed at seven year intervals to accommodate the time scales over which significant changes can be expected to occur. However, the Plan can be amended any time within this period, if required.

The Plan will be supported by the annual implementation program. The implementation program will review accomplishments from the preceding year and determine specific priorities for the coming year. It will provide the means for Sanctuary planning to respond to unexpected developments and time sensitive issues.

Public consultation on the Plan is very important to its success. In response to public submissions, amendments have been made to the Bill to increase the transparency of the consultation process.

#### **Advisory Board (clause 12)**

The role of the Advisory Board is to advise the Minister on the preparation of the Management Plan and to advise the Minister on its effectiveness after it is implemented. An additional Advisory Board function has been added to require the Board to provide advice on expenditure of money in the Fund (clause 22).

A number of public submissions suggested greater clarity for the appointment process for Board members and changes have been made to achieve this increase in transparency, along with several minor changes to improve administration of the Board's activities.

The ongoing administration of the Sanctuary will be undertaken by the Minister and officers from the Department for Environment and Heritage.

#### **Functions and powers of the Minister (clause 25)**

This section defines the functions and powers of the Minister and emphasises the importance of working with the community through consultation and education programs. The Minister will be required to act to integrate the administration of the Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary Act with other relevant Acts and also to promote monitoring and research programs for the Sanctuary.

#### **Powers of authorised officers (clause 29)**

These powers of authorised officers are to be used only in the enforcement of the general duty of care. It is not expected that this provision will be frequently used. Most of the compliance actions for the Sanctuary will be provided by enforcement of the amended Acts.

After evaluation of public submissions, some amendments to improve operational efficiency have been made.

#### **General duty of care (clause 32)**

It is expected that the activities which may be regulated within the Sanctuary will largely be covered under existing legislation. To date, Department for Environment and Heritage officers have not identified any activity which would be addressed by the general duty of care.

#### **Protection and other orders (Part 6)**

Provision for protection and reparation orders and reparation authorisations has been made in the event compliance with the general duty of care is required. These measures are included to provide certainty for the administration of the Act.

#### **Provisions relating to official insignia (Part 7)**

This Part provides protection for the use of official insignia which may be created to support the operations of the Sanctuary and prescribes penalties for any misuse of this insignia.

#### **Native title (clause 46)**

Clause 46 provides assurance that nothing done under the Act will affect native title in land or water unless it is covered under a relevant law of South Australia or the Commonwealth *Native Title Act 1993*. Kaurna people have a registered native title claim over the area encompassed by the Sanctuary.

#### **Definition of the Sanctuary (Schedule 1)**

The boundaries were determined to both largely encompass the resident dolphin population and their habitat and to ensure members of the public and authorised officers can readily locate and patrol the boundaries. This habitat includes places where dolphins can physically swim and also tidal areas where their food sources may be found.

Most of the land borders are determined by sea water levee banks and the mean high water mark.

Mutton Cove and reclaimed Crown land at the St Kilda boat ramp are included, along with Port Gawler Conservation Park and some adjacent Crown land to mean high water mark for ease and consistency of management planning.

All land above high water mark within Sanctuary waters will be included – Torrens and Garden Islands (including Torrens Island Conservation Park) and the small unnamed island off Outer Harbor known as Bird Island.

#### **Related amendments to other Acts (Schedule 2)**

The 11 acts have been amended as relevant to each Act's responsibilities within the Sanctuary. Most activities require the relevant ministers of these acts to consult with and have regard to the Sanctuary Minister's advice on any proposed activity. The three Acts which might potentially be responsible for changes in land use – the Aquaculture, Mining and Petroleum Acts – require the concurrence of the Sanctuary Minister before initiating new activities under these Acts.

One of the amendments to the *National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972* bans hunting within the Sanctuary. The maximum penalties prescribed by this Act and the *Fisheries Act 1982* for harming marine mammals, including dolphins, are increased from \$30 000 to \$100 000.

In addition, the Management Plan may identify a need and consequently recommend amendments to regulations under any of the 11 related operational Acts.

A number of public submissions raised concerns and questions about how actions taken under the Development Act will be managed in relation to the Sanctuary. Any development within the Sanctuary, or one that will have a direct or significant impact on it, will require consultation with the Sanctuary Minister. After the form and substance of the Management Plan is determined, and after the *Development (Sustainable Development) Amendment Bill 2004* is finalised, opportunities to provide more direct links between the two Acts will be explored, including the possibilities of alterations to applicable PARs and amendments to Schedule 8 referrals.

#### **Consultation**

Preliminary public consultation on the establishment of the Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary was held in 2002. Over 450 public submissions were received and approximately 250 people attended five public information meetings.

The draft *Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary Bill 2003* was released for a two month public consultation period in December 2003. Seventeen written submissions were received. A public information meeting was also held in Port Adelaide in January 2004.

A ministerial Steering Committee has reviewed the public submissions and formulated its own recommendations about changes to the draft Bill which were presented to the Minister for Environment and Conservation for consideration.

The Government appreciates the time and effort members of the Steering Committee and members of the public have contributed to this process so far. Public and targeted consultation will continue as the Sanctuary is further developed.

The *Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary Bill 2004* is this Government's response to the community's desire to offer greater protection to the Port Adelaide dolphins and their habitat. It is also a direct reflection of the community's wider desire to care for our environmental heritage.

I commend this Bill to the House.

#### **EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES**

##### **Part 1—Preliminary**

##### **1—Short title**

##### **2—Commencement**

These clauses are formal.

##### **3—Interpretation**

This clause contains definitions and other interpretative provisions.

#### **4—Interaction with other Acts**

This clause provides that the measure is in addition to and does not limit or derogate from the provisions of any other Act.

#### **5—Related operational Acts**

This clause prescribes certain Acts as related operational Acts and provides for additional Acts to be prescribed as such by regulation.

#### **6—Act binds Crown**

This clause provides that the measure binds the Crown in right of the State and also, so far as the legislative power of the State extends, the Crown in all its other capacities, but not so as to impose any criminal liability on the Crown.

It also provides that all agencies and instrumentalities of the Crown must endeavour, as far as practicable, to act consistently with the Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary Management Plan.

### **Part 2—Objects of Act and statutory objectives**

#### **7—Objects**

This clause provides that the objects of the measure are to protect the dolphin population of the Port Adelaide River estuary and Barker Inlet and to protect the natural habitat of that population.

#### **8—Objectives**

This clause sets out the objectives that will apply in connection with the operation of the measure.

#### **9—Administration of Act to achieve objects and objectives**

This clause requires the Minister, the Advisory Board, the Environment, Resources and Development Court and other persons or bodies involved in the administration of the measure, and any other person or body required to consider the operation or application of the measure to act consistently with, and seek to further, the objects and objectives of the measure.

### **Part 3—Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary**

#### **Division 1—Sanctuary**

##### **10—Establishment of Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary**

This clause establishes a sanctuary to be called the Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary.

The Sanctuary consists of the area defined in Schedule 1.

The clause empowers the Governor to alter the boundaries of the Sanctuary by regulation but such a regulation cannot take effect unless and until it has been laid before both Houses of Parliament and—

- (a) no motion for disallowance of the regulation is moved within the time for such a motion; or
- (b) every motion for disallowance of the regulation has been defeated or withdrawn, or has lapsed.

#### **Division 2—Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary Management Plan**

##### **11—ADS Management Plan**

This clause requires the Minister to prepare a management plan for the Sanctuary within 12 months of the commencement of the measure.

The plan must set out—

- (a) the proposals of the Minister in relation to the management of the Sanctuary; and
- (b) the priorities that the Minister will pursue in order to achieve the objects and objectives of this Act in relation to the Sanctuary.

The plan must be reviewed at least once in every 7 years and the Minister may amend the plan at any time.

The plan is an expression of policy and does not in itself affect rights or liabilities (whether of a substantive, procedural or other nature).

#### **Division 3—Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary Advisory Board**

##### **12—Establishment of ADS Advisory Board**

This clause establishes the Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary Advisory Board and provides for it to consist of 11 members appointed by the Governor on the nomination of the Minister. The membership must include persons who together have, in the Minister's opinion, knowledge of, and experience in, a number of specified areas. The Minister must not nominate a person for appointment unless of the opinion that the person has a commitment to the protection and enhancement of the

Port River estuary and Barker Inlet. At least 2 members must be women and at least 2 must be men.

#### **13—Presiding member**

This clause requires the Minister to appoint one of the members of the Advisory Board to be the presiding member of the Board.

#### **14—Terms and conditions of membership**

This clause provides for a term of appointment not exceeding 3 years and for the reappointment of members and sets out the grounds on which the Governor may remove a member from office and the situations in which the office of a member becomes vacant.

#### **15—Vacancies or defects in appointment of members**

This clause provides that an act or proceeding of the Advisory Board is not invalid by reason only of a vacancy in its membership or a defect in the appointment of a member.

#### **16—Remuneration**

This clause entitles a member of the Advisory Board to remuneration, allowances and expenses determined by the Governor.

#### **17—Functions of Board**

This clause provides that the function of the Advisory Board is to advise the Minister on the following matters:

- (a) the preparation of the ADS Management Plan and any amendments to the Plan; and
- (b) the effectiveness of the ADS Management Plan in achieving the objects and objectives of the measure; and
- (c) the effectiveness of the implementation program; and
- (d) the application of money belonging to the ADS Fund; and
- (e) any matter referred to the Board by the Minister; and
- (f) any matter connected with the administration of the measure on which the Board believes it should advise the Minister.

#### **18—Committees**

This clause empowers the Advisory Board, with Ministerial approval, to establish committees to provide advice to the Board on matters referred to the committee by the Board.

#### **19—Board's procedures**

This clause deals with the Board's procedures at meetings.

#### **20—Staff, facilities etc**

This clause requires the Minister to make available to the Advisory Board such staff, facilities, information and assistance as it may reasonably require for the effective performance of its functions.

#### **21—Annual report**

This clause requires the Advisory Board to prepare and deliver to the Minister an annual report on its operations. The Minister must table the report in both Houses of Parliament within 12 sitting days after receiving it.

#### **Division 4—Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary Fund**

##### **22—ADS Fund**

This clause provides for there to be a fund kept in a separate account at the Treasury to be called the Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary Fund. The fund will consist of money provided by Parliament or the Commonwealth Government for the purposes of the fund, grants, gifts and bequests made to the Minister for payment into the fund, proceeds from sales of goods forfeited to the Crown under the Act, income arising from investment of the fund and any other money required or authorised by law to be paid into the fund. The Minister may apply the fund to further the objects or objectives of the measure and in payment of expenses of administering the fund. Before applying the fund for the former purpose, the Minister must have regard to any advice provided by the ADS Advisory Board.

##### **23—Accounts**

This clause requires the Minister to keep proper accounts in relation to the fund.

##### **24—Audit**

This clause empowers the Auditor-General to audit the accounts of the funds at any time and requires an audit to be carried out at least once in each year.

### **Part 4—Administration**

#### **Division 1—Minister**

##### **25—Functions and powers of Minister**

This clause sets out the functions and powers of the Minister under the measure. It requires the administration of the



measure and the *Coast Protection Act 1972* to be committed to the same Minister.

#### **26—Annual report**

This clause requires the Minister to prepare an annual report on the operation of the measure. The report must, among other things, include a program setting out the Minister's proposals for the implementation of the ADS Management Plan for the current financial year. The Minister must table the report in both Houses of Parliament within 12 sitting days after its preparation.

#### **27—Power of delegation**

This clause empowers the Minister to delegate functions or powers of the Minister under the measure.

#### **Division 2—Authorised officers**

##### **28—Appointment of authorised officers**

This clause empowers the Minister to appoint authorised officers for the purposes of the measure.

##### **29—Powers of authorised officers**

This clause sets out the powers of authorised officers.

##### **30—Hindering etc persons engaged in administration of Act**

This clause makes it an offence for a person to hinder an authorised officer, use certain language to an authorised officer, refuse or fail to comply with a requirement of an authorised officer, refuse or fail to answer questions to the best of the person's knowledge, information or belief, or falsely represent that the person is an authorised officer.

##### **31—Protection from self-incrimination**

This clause provides that a person is not obliged to answer a question or to produce a document or record as required under this Part if to do so might tend to incriminate the person or make the person liable to a penalty.

#### **Part 5—General duty of care**

##### **32—General duty of care**

This clause imposes a duty on persons to take all reasonable measures to prevent or minimise any harm to the Sanctuary through their actions or activities. Breach of the duty is not, of itself, an offence, but compliance with the duty may be enforced by the issuing of a protection order under Part 6 and a reparation order or reparation authorisation may be issued under that Part in respect of the breach of the duty of care.

#### **Part 6—Protection and other orders**

##### **Division 1—Orders**

##### **33—Protection orders**

This clause empowers the Minister to issue a protection order to secure compliance with the general duty of care. If urgent action is required, an authorised officer may issue an emergency protection order, but the order expires after 72 hours unless it is confirmed by a protection order made by the Minister. Failure to comply with a protection order constitutes an offence punishable by a maximum penalty of \$2 500 if the order was issued in relation to a domestic activity for the purpose of securing compliance with the general duty of care, or of \$120 000 in any other case. The offence is expiable on payment of a fee of \$250 if the order was issued in relation to a domestic activity for the purpose of securing compliance with the general duty of care, or of \$500 in any other case. The clause also makes it an offence, punishable by a maximum penalty of \$10 000, to hinder or obstruct a person complying with a protection order.

##### **34—Action on non-compliance with protection order**

This clause empowers the Minister to take any action required by a protection order if the requirements of the order are not complied with, and to recover reasonable costs and expenses incurred by the Minister in doing so as a debt from the person who failed to comply with the order.

##### **35—Reparation orders**

This clause empowers the Minister to issue a reparation order if the Minister is satisfied that a person has caused harm to the Sanctuary by contravening the general duty of care or a condition of a statutory authorisation that relates to an activity carried out within the Sanctuary. If urgent action is required, an authorised officer may issue an emergency reparation order, but the order expires after 72 hours unless it is confirmed by a reparation order made by the Minister. Failure to comply with a protection order constitutes an offence punishable by a maximum penalty of \$50 000.

##### **36—Action on non-compliance with reparation order**

This clause empowers the Minister to take any action required by a reparation order if the requirements of the order are not complied with, and to recover reasonable costs and expenses incurred by the Minister in doing so as a debt from the person who failed to comply with the order. If the amount owing to the Minister is not paid, the person is liable to pay interest on the unpaid amount and the unpaid amount, together with any interest to which the person is liable is, until paid, a charge in favour of the Minister on any land owned by the person in relation to which the order is registered under Division 2.

##### **37—Reparation authorisations**

This clause empowers the Minister to issue a reparation authorisation if the Minister is satisfied that a person has caused harm to the Sanctuary by contravening the general duty of care or a condition of a statutory authorisation that relates to an activity carried out within the Sanctuary. Under the authorisation authorised officers or other persons may be authorised to take specified action on the Minister's behalf to make good any resulting damage to the Sanctuary. The Minister may recover reasonable costs and expenses incurred by the Minister in taking action as a debt from the person who caused the relevant harm. If the amount owing to the Minister is not paid, the person is liable to pay interest on the unpaid amount and the unpaid amount, together with any interest to which the person is liable is, until paid, a charge in favour of the Minister on any land owned by the person in relation to which the order is registered under Division 2.

##### **38—Related matters**

This clause provides that the Minister should, so far as is reasonably practicable, consult with any other public authority that may also have power to act with respect to the particular matter before the Minister issues a protection order, reparation order or reparation authorisation. However, this does not apply where action is being taken as a matter of urgency or in a circumstance of a prescribed kind. A person cannot claim compensation from the Minister, the Crown, an authorised officer or a person acting under the authority of the Minister or an authorised officer in respect of a requirement imposed under this Division, or on account of any act or omission undertaken or made in the exercise or purported exercise of a power under this Division.

#### **Division 2—Registration of orders and effect of charges**

##### **39—Registration**

This clause provides for the registration of reparation orders and reparation authorisations relating to an activity carried out on land or requiring a person to take action on or in relation to land. An order or authorisation registered under this clause binds each owner and occupier from time to time of the land.

##### **40—Effect of charge**

This clause provides that a charge imposed under Division 1 has priority over prior charges (whether registered or unregistered) that operate in favour of a person who is an associate of the owner of the land and any other charge registered prior to the registration of the relevant order or authorisation.

#### **Division 3—Appeals to ERD Court**

##### **41—Appeal**

This clause gives a person to whom a protection order or reparation order is issued a right of appeal to the Environment, Resources and Development Court.

#### **Part 7—Provisions relating to official insignia**

##### **42—Interpretation**

This clause defines "official insignia" and makes other interpretative provisions.

##### **43—Declaration of logo**

This clause empowers the Minister to declare a design to be a logo for the purposes of this Part.

##### **44—Protection of official insignia**

This clause declares that the Crown has a proprietary interest in all official insignia and makes it an offence to use official insignia for commercial purposes without Ministerial consent. It also makes it an offence to assume a name or description consisting of or including official insignia without Ministerial consent. In each case a maximum fine of \$20 000 is fixed. The Supreme Court is empowered to restrain breaches by granting injunctions to the Minister and a court by which a

person is convicted of an offence against the clause may order the person to pay compensation to the Minister.

#### **45—Seizure and forfeiture of goods**

This clause empowers an authorised officer to seize goods in relation to which official insignia has been used without Ministerial authorisation and provides that a court by which a person is convicted of an offence under clause 44 may order the goods to be forfeited to the Crown. The Minister may sell or otherwise dispose of forfeited goods. If sold, the proceeds of the sale must be paid into the ADS Fund. If goods are seized and proceedings for an offence are not commenced within 3 months or the defendant is not convicted, the person from whom the goods were seized is entitled to recover the goods, or to compensation if they have been destroyed equal to their market value, as well as compensation for any loss suffered by reason of the seizure.

#### **Part 8—Miscellaneous**

##### **46—Native title**

This clause provides that nothing done under this measure will be taken to affect native title in any land or water unless the effect is valid under a law of the State or the *Native Title Act 1993* of the Commonwealth.

##### **47—Immunity provision**

This clause provides that no act or omission of the Minister or any other person engaged in the administration of the measure, or by another person or body acting under the authority of the Minister, undertaken or made with a view to—

- (a) exercising or performing a power or function under the measure; or
- (b) protecting, restoring or enhancing the Sanctuary, or any aspect of the Sanctuary (including by exercising or performing a power or function under other legislation); or
- (c) furthering the objectives of the measure (including by exercising or performing a power or function under other legislation),

gives rise to any liability against the Minister, person or body, or the Crown.

##### **48—Continuing offence**

This clause provides that if a person is convicted of an offence that relates to a continuing act or omission, the person may be liable to an additional penalty for each day that the act or omission continued (but not so as to exceed one tenth of the maximum penalty for the offence).

##### **49—Offences by bodies corporate**

This clause provides that if a body corporate commits an offence against the measure, each member of the governing body, and the manager, of the body corporate are guilty of an offence and liable to the same penalty as is prescribed for the principal offence where the offender is a natural person. A person may be prosecuted and convicted whether or not the body corporate has been prosecuted or convicted of the offence committed by the body corporate.

##### **50—General defence**

This clause provides a defence of a charge of an offence against the measure if the defendant provides that the alleged defence was not committed intentionally and did not result from any failure on the part of the defendant to take reasonable care to avoid the commission of the offence.

##### **51—Criminal jurisdiction of ERD Court**

This clause provides that offences constituted by the measure lie within the criminal jurisdiction of the Environment, Resources and Development Court.

##### **52—Confidentiality**

This clause makes it an offence for a person engaged or formerly engaged in the administration of the Act to divulge or communicate personal information obtained (whether by that person or otherwise) in the course of official duties except—

- (a) as required or authorised by law; or
- (b) with the consent of the person to whom the information relates; or
- (c) in connection with the administration of this measure; or
- (d) to an agency or instrumentality of this State, the Commonwealth or another State or Territory for the purposes of the proper performance of its functions.

A maximum fine of \$5 000 is fixed.

However, it is not an offence to disclose statistical or other non-identifying data.

Information disclosed under the clause for a particular purpose must not be used for any other purpose by the person to whom it was disclosed or any other person who gains access to the information as a result of that disclosure. A maximum penalty of \$5 000 is fixed.

##### **53—Service**

This clause sets out the manner in which notices, orders and other documents may be served.

##### **54—Evidentiary provision**

This clause provides an evidentiary aid for proceedings for offences against the measure.

##### **55—Regulations**

This clause empowers the Governor to make regulations for the purposes of the measure.

##### **Schedule 1—Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary**

This Schedule defines the boundaries of the Sanctuary.

##### **Schedule 2—Related amendments**

This Schedule amends the related operational Acts specified in clause 5.

The amendments to the *Aquaculture Act 2001* require aquaculture policies that apply to the Sanctuary to seek to further the objects and objectives of the ADS legislation and require the Minister to obtain the concurrence of the Minister for the Sanctuary before approving a draft policy that will apply within the Sanctuary.

The amendments to the *Coast Protection Act 1972* require the Coast Protection Board to take into account and seek to further the objects and objectives of the ADS legislation when taking any action within the Sanctuary or action that is likely to have a direct impact on the Sanctuary. The amendments also require the Board to consult with and have regard to the views of the Minister in preparing or reviewing a management plan that could affect the Sanctuary.

The amendments to the *Development Act 1993* provide that the Planning Strategy will be taken to include the objectives of the ADS legislation. Section 24 of the Act is amended to enable the Minister to make amendments to a Development Plan where the purpose is to promote the objects or objectives of the ADS legislation. Section 34 is amended to enable the Minister to declare that the Development Assessment Commission should act as the relevant authority in relation to a proposed development because, in the opinion of the Minister for the Sanctuary, the proposed development may have a significant impact on an aspect of the Sanctuary. Other amendments ensure that an EIS, DR or PER that relates to a development or project that is to be undertaken within the Sanctuary, or is likely to have a direct impact on the Sanctuary, is referred to the Minister for the Sanctuary.

The amendment to the *Environment Protection Act 1993* requires all persons and bodies involved in the administration of the Act to take into account the objects and objectives of the ADS legislation when taking any action within, or in relation to, any part of the Sanctuary.

The amendments to the *Fisheries Act 1982* require the Minister and Director of Fisheries to seek to further the objects and objectives of the ADS legislation in administering the Fisheries Act. Other amendments increase the maximum penalties for offences involving marine mammals, require the Minister to temporarily prohibit fishing activities in the Sanctuary on the request of the Minister for the Sanctuary, require the Director to consult and have regard to the views of that Minister before deciding whether to grant an application to release exotic or farm fish into natural waters, and require the Minister to consult with and have regard to the views of the Minister for the Sanctuary in relation to proposed research, works or other operations under section 31 and in relation to applications relating to exemptions under section 59.

The amendments to the *Harbors and Navigation Act 1993* add the objects and objectives of the ADS legislation to those of the Harbors and Navigation Act and impose a duty on persons engaged in administering the Act to take into account and seek to further the objects and objectives of the ADS legislation when taking any action within the Sanctuary or action that is likely to have a direct impact on the Sanctuary. Amendments to section 26 require the CEO to consult with and have regard to the views of the Minister for the Sanctuary before granting a licence under that section in relation to waters that form part of the Sanctuary.

The amendments to the *Historic Shipwrecks Act 1981* require the Minister to seek to further the objects and objectives of the ADS legislation when considering an application for a permit relating to an historic shipwreck or historic relic in the Sanctuary. Prescribed

classes of applications for such a permit or for an activity to be undertaken within the Sanctuary cannot be determined by the Minister until he or she has consulted with and had regard to the views of the Minister for the Sanctuary.

The amendments to the *Mining Act 1971* require the Minister to take into account the objects and objectives of the ADS legislation in administering the Act. Other amendments are to require that an application for a licence or lease relating to an area within or adjacent to the Sanctuary be referred to the Minister for the Sanctuary and if the Minister responsible for the Mining Act and the Minister for the Sanctuary cannot agree on whether the application should be granted or the conditions to which the licence or lease should be subject, the matter must be referred to the Governor for determination. In the case of an application for the renewal of a licence or lease that relates to an area within or adjacent to the Sanctuary, the Minister must, before determining the application, consult with and have regard to the views of the Minister for the Sanctuary. The amendments also require applications for authorisation to use prescribed equipment in relation to an area within or adjacent to the Sanctuary to be referred to the Minister for the Sanctuary and determinations made by the Governor if the Director of Mines and Minister for the Sanctuary cannot agree on whether the application should be granted or the conditions to which an authorisation should be subject.

The amendments to the *National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972* require the Minister, the Chief Executive and the Director to seek to further the objects and objectives of the ADS legislation in managing reserves situated wholly or partly within the Sanctuary. The amendments also increase maximum penalties for offences involving marine mammals and provide that a permit cannot authorise hunting within the Sanctuary or the possession of firearms or other devices for hunting while in the Sanctuary. In addition, any permit under the Act relating to an activity within the Sanctuary must be consistent with the objects and objectives of the ADS legislation and the Minister must, before making a decision on an application of a prescribed class, consult with and have regard to the views of the Minister for the Sanctuary.

The amendments to the *Native Vegetation Act 1991* provide that the Native Vegetation Council can only delegate powers in relation to a matter within the Sanctuary with the approval of the Minister for the Sanctuary. The Act is also amended to require that guidelines under section 25 relating to land within the Sanctuary must seek to further the objects and objectives of the ADS legislation. Other amendments are to require that the Council, before determining applications of a prescribed class for consent relating to native vegetation consult with and have regard to the views of the Minister for the Sanctuary, and to add to the principles of native vegetation clearance a principle relating to the Sanctuary.

The amendments to the *Petroleum Act 2000* require the Minister to take into account the objects and objectives of the ADS legislation in administering the Petroleum Act and require applications for licences relating to areas within or adjacent to the Sanctuary to be referred to the Minister for the Sanctuary. If the Ministers cannot agree on whether an application should be granted or on the conditions to which a licence should be subject, the matter must be referred to the Governor for determination. The Minister must consult with and have regard to the views of the Minister for the Sanctuary in relation to applications for renewals of licences relating to areas within or adjacent to the Sanctuary. Statements or revised statements of environmental objectives applying to any part of the Sanctuary must not be approved by the Minister without the concurrence of the Minister for the Sanctuary. If concurrence cannot be obtained, the matter must be referred to the Governor for determination.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned on motion (continued from page 81.)

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite):** I rise to thank the Governor's Deputy for his address at the commencement of the Fourth Session of the Fiftieth Parliament and to reflect on the two and a half years that have passed in the life of this Labor government and the year and a half that remain ahead.

The Premier must be sitting back and gasping in amazement. The most unpopular leader of the opposition in the country finds himself the most popular premier in the country. Likewise, the Treasurer must be in awe of the buoyant economic times we are experiencing. He must be overjoyed at the powerful economic wave that this government has been able to ride. Of course all South Australians know that this government had nothing whatsoever to do with those buoyant economic times. All South Australians know that those buoyant economic times are the result a period of outstanding stewardship by the Howard federal government since 1996 that has seen significant economic reform and, to give credit, reforms set in place by former federal Labor governments, with the full support of their federal Liberal oppositions. We support reform.

The Premier and Treasurer must also understand that it was actually the sound economic management of the former state Liberal government that delivered such buoyant economic times. The Treasurer would well remember when Standard & Poor's lifted us up to AA plus, having lost our AAA rating as a consequence as Labor's mismanagement of the State Bank debacle, that Standard & Poor's made the point that the main reason this upgrading was occurring was because state debt had been reduced from almost \$10 billion to barely \$3 billion of state debt today. Why? Because we were forced to sell assets to remit that debt so that the state could escape the shackles of economic constraint that it had experienced in the years that followed the State Bank collapse. The government must be amazed at its luck. You could almost say that a party of gorillas could drive the car down the road, so buoyant are the economic circumstances. Provided they do not do anything wrong, the car will probably stay on the road.

*Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:*

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** I would argue that we do not have a bunch of gorillas but a bunch of monkeys, as my colleague the member for Kavel points out.

So, has the government made any mistakes? One excellent way to avoid making mistakes is not to do anything. Do not build any major infrastructure or make any major investments, do not invest in industry development, do not spend, because if you do not spend or do anything you will avoid making a mistake. The government has excelled at that. Apart from doing nothing, except for summits, reviews and glossy brochures, the government has done some things: it has resisted earnestly the inquiry into the abuse of children while wards of the state. It has been dragged kicking and screaming by the opposition and minor parties to the table. Not only that, it has done some other things: the Premier's most trusted confidante and senior adviser is facing charges of corruption. The Attorney thinks the adviser was acting under the auspices of the Premier. That matter is before the courts and I will not explore it further, except to say that it is a government tainted by corruption—let us not forget it. It is a government of bover boys and bullies, a government that shoots the messenger, a government that wants to take the bat to Frances Nelson QC when she is critical of the government. It is a government that wants to abuse or blame boards, wants to criticise, denigrate or bash anyone who stands up and is critical of it. Of course three or four of the lead bover boys sit on the front bench. Abusing your opposition, obfuscation, media management, spin, spin, spin—these are the hallmarks of this government. Yet the Treasurer gets up today and takes credit for the BankSA trends report, indicating some positive

economic KPIs for the state. No credit due to this government, and I will get back to that point later in my address.

I turn now to education, to what I would call some Labor lies. Particularly I want to pick up the issue peddled this week about public and private school funding. I want to reflect, as the member for Waite representing the area of Mitcham, an area that contains and comprises some of the state's leading public schools: Unley High School, Mitcham Girls High School and Urrbrae, along with some outstanding state primary schools such as Westbourne Park, Colonel Light Gardens, Clapham and Pasadena. I have some outstanding schools that do a wonderful job. The staff are dedicated and the parent councils are committed. They are wonderful school communities. I also have four Catholic schools: Mercedes, Cabra and others.

Scotch College, which is one of the schools earmarked for slashing by Mark Latham, St John's and other schools are in my electorate. In my community, this Mark Latham federal Labor initiative is being perceived as a divisive wedge. With the full support of the Rann Labor government, Latham has promulgated an arrangement whereby extra funding will be provided to the state school system, and I commend that. Extra funding will be provided to the Catholic schools, and I commend that. But funding will be taken away from the non-Catholic private schools and switched to the Catholic private schools.

So, the perception amongst the families, the perception the kids are taking to school into the playground, the perception in the streets of Mitcham—and it is a perception deliberately set by the Latham federal opposition—is that it wants to take the money away from the non-Catholic schools and give it to the Catholic schools. It is divisive: it is putting community against community, denomination against denomination and family against family. In my extended family, we have kids at Mercedes, at Scotch and at state schools, and they get together. It is a simple matter of Latham planning to take money from one of those kids and to give it to the other. If Latham were smart, he would have provided extra funding for the state schools and for the Catholic schools and, in addition, not ripped the money away from the non-Catholic private schools. Those children have a right to state taxpayer and federal taxpayer support as well.

This brings me to the next Labor lie, namely, the amount of taxpayer funding that goes into private and public schooling. Let me give the house the facts and the truth—something the people of South Australia are not getting from Mark Latham, this Premier or this Labor government. On the latest figures available, each child in an independent school in this state receives \$3 968 of taxpayer funding, comprising \$1 257 of state funding (which originates from the commonwealth) and \$2 711 of commonwealth funding. It is just shy of \$4 000. What does the same child in a government school receive? They receive \$8 413 (which is more than twice as much), comprising \$7 642 of state money and \$771 of commonwealth funding. So, if one brother attended a state school and another attended a private school, the one attending the state school would receive twice as much taxpayer funding as the one at the private school.

These facts expose the Labor lie about education funding. People are not stupid: they understand the lie being peddled. If you look at these figures as a proportion of government expenditure, they really are quite striking. As I mentioned, the government student receives \$8 413; the Catholic student, \$4 671; and the non-Catholic independent school student, \$3 968. These are startling figures. It is also interesting to

note that at present the Catholic independent schools receive \$4 671 per student, whereas the non-Catholic independent schools receive only \$3 968. As it is, the Catholic schools are, quite rightly and quite deservedly, well funded, but better funded than the non-Catholic schools.

I am not in favour of policies that divide communities. I believe that the Catholic independent schools, the state schools and the non-Catholic independent schools all deserve extra funding. I am pleased that both parties have formed policies that promote the concept—except for the Latham Labor policy, which robs Peter to pay Paul and which is dividing the community. The lie that all families at private schools are wealthy and that all families at public schools are not is obvious to most South Australians. They are not so stupid that they will be fooled by this policy.

Apart from this political fraud, I have other issues with the way this government approaches education. In my electorate, I have serious issues at Pasadena High School. It seeks to sell a portion of the land it occupies and turn that money back into the school. The government is doing nothing to help it with that process, nor is it providing funding as an alternative to the sale of that land. It needs assistance with the self-management foisted upon it by this government within 14 weeks. It needs a vision, support for the future and a range of support with key issues relating to traffic management and funding for the disabled. The situation is so serious I have asked to lead a delegation to see the minister urgently to resolve some of these concerns.

Colonel Light Gardens Primary School is to receive the \$2.8 million provided by the former government, which, gratefully, has not been axed. I thank the former minister for not axing that funding, but the work has still not begun. Mitcham Primary School has issues. Unley, Mitcham Girls High and Clapham are all schools that have issues that need to be addressed, and I have corresponded with the minister on these in recent weeks. All the schools have hardworking teachers, governing councils and a vibrant community, but they need support.

Labor is lying to people about private education and public funding. It has deceived people in its approach to self-management. It harped and harped about Partnerships 21, the great evil. It stated that self-management was terrible. I have copious notes about the member for West Torrens, the former shadow minister and a stack of Labor Party members all rubbishing the concept of self-management and Partnerships 21. What was the first thing this government did? It stuck with the concept of self-management, and now it is foisting it upon schools, some of which are in my electorate—not with carrots, as we did, nor with financial incentives but with punitive, threatening, forceful measures. It needs to be handled with far greater sensitivity.

The reality is that there is not a great deal of difference between Liberal and Labor on the issue of education. The former government did a great job on schools and education. Despite all the huff and puff and media spin, this government is spending no more in real terms. I sense no celebration in the schools in my electorate, that they are besieged with extra SSO hours, extra teaching staff and extra resources.

I do not sense at all that the earthmoving equipment and the builders are lined up out the front of my schools waiting to move in to repair, maintain and renovate the schools. In fact, under a Liberal government schools in my electorate have only just been rebuilt. For example, Unley, Westbourne Park and Urrbrae schools suffered years of decline and neglect under the Bannon regime. It was only when we came

into office that the schools were fixed. The money went elsewhere. I really question this government on education.

I want to talk about the Mitcham Shopping Centre fire, the greatest and largest fire in the metropolitan area, I think, for over 20 years. Almost every appliance available in the metropolitan area attended. The MFS had to bring CFS people into the city to man its brigades while they were attending. We heard nothing from the government on this until a media release two days after the event—I think that it was late on the Monday. The fire was Saturday night. Finally, we had the minister squawking on Tuesday morning, ‘Oh, oh, we had better do something and offer funding under the State Emergency Act.’ An undertaking was given on radio which has not been delivered on.

We then had the government saying, ‘Look, we had better send someone out.’ So, on Tuesday, someone came out from the Office of Small Business, and I thank the staff for that. They did provide valuable assistance; but to come out offering food coupons on the Tuesday was not the type of support that was sought. Later on in the week, when things warmed up and the government did sense the urgency of the matter, good support was provided. Essentially, the only real and tangible support the Mitcham shop traders had was each other. I have written to the Premier. I was disappointed that neither he nor the minister attended until day eight.

I think that it was the Monday or the Tuesday week after the fire when, finally, the Premier turned up. That is in stark contrast to his attendance at the railway accident, I think in the seat of Makin, and the situation that occurred at the Patawalonga in the federal seat of Hindmarsh. It was quite remarkable. It seems that when there is a major disaster somewhere else in town it is a matter for the Premier’s immediate attention, but when it is a serious emergency in Mitcham it is not. That is a point not lost on the community of Mitcham, which I represent.

I have written to the Premier and asked him to consider a number of things to help this community through this tragedy. The shopping centre is the heart of Mitcham. It has been burnt to a cinder. I commend the Taplin Group (Noel and Andrew Taplin) for their quick action to get things moving in the way of repair, and I commend all the shop traders. However, the government needs to do certain things. First, I think it needs a capability to respond better to such crises on behalf of small business. It should have a ready reaction group, if you like, ready to form part of our disaster response to help small businesses.

Funding needs to be allocated to help employees to relocate, etc., in such crises. Legal assistance and other help needs to be provided, and it was provided through the Small Business Helpline, but extra funding and more resources are required. However, in regard to Mitcham, I am asking the government to consider advancing the \$2.9 million request which it has had for some time and which it inherited from the former government to help with the upgrade of Belair Road that surrounds the shopping centre as part of the rebuilding program. There will now be a need for a multi-million dollar rebuilding of this centre.

It is vital for pensioners. We have lost banks, post offices and services that are essential to people, some of whom approach and leave the centre on a walking frame. Some people come on a bicycle or travel only small distances. They need this shopping centre reconstructed. The government can help by making its contribution through the roads program and roads funding to help repair the roads around the centre and to make things good, and I urge the government to do

that. I have also asked that the government look at some sort of land tax relief to the Taplin Group so that that money can then be turned back into promoting the centre once it is fully operating.

As I said, I think that the government was slow to respond, but it is not the fault of the public servants who ultimately did respond. They did a great job. It was really the Minister for Small Business and the Premier who, I think, were slow out of the blocks, and I hope that that does not happen to the detriment of any other community when something like this happens again, as no doubt it will. I would like to say, ‘Well done’ to many of the community in the Mitcham shops. Mr Kipirtoglou from Framingland; Bruce Berry the butcher; Paula Rhodes and Emma Leach from Sweet Times who had just moved their business into the centre and it burnt to the ground; and Malcolm Hollow and his wife from Cafe Xenia.

I also mention Richard Elliot from Premier Communications; Richard Bastian, the jewellers; Ray Zwech from Michel’s Patisserie; Alison Kilty and Linda Morgan from Xanadu Giftware; Ron McNell from Sportspower; and Rory Poland, the newsagent, who is already up and operating in improvised premises at the site; Mary Kyriacou from the Letterbox Cafe, which was burnt to a cinder (Mary and her staff have a fantastic community presence); and Gary Ludwig from Mitcham Cycles. Of course, Julia and Marie Therese Stevens used to run the corner shop, not far from the shopping centre, as I grew up, and they now run the Bass outlet.

These are just a few of the people who have lost everything or nearly everything in this fire. There are many more people whom I have not mentioned. I say ‘Well done’ to all of you. Australian Post was fantastic. The police and emergency services were just brilliant. This is a community and, when it is faced with a challenge such as this, it comes alive, and it has done so. I say to the government, ‘Could you be quicker off the mark next time, and could you please look at what you can do’—I note that the minister is coming into the chamber—‘in the transport area in terms of rebuilding these roads around the Mitcham Shopping Centre?’ Let us see whether we can find the money so that when the Taplin Group and the shop owners get their lives back the government has done its part to help that shopping centre recover.

I make the general point that this government has backflipped on education. Partnerships 21 was terrible. Suddenly, self-management of schools is a good thing. This government has backflipped on a range of issues. It seems that when you are in opposition these things are terrible. However, when you get into government, suddenly, it is good commonsense and we all should be doing it.

There are a number of these Labor lies. There is nothing more obvious, of course, than the old Labor lie about the privatisation of ETSA and the sale of our electricity assets. The Premier and the Treasurer are back there crowing about the economy and how good things are, but, of course, they are very happy to receive the benefits of the reduction of state debt from \$10 billion to \$3 billion. They are delighted to get Standard and Poor’s lifting our rating for AA plus. The Treasurer cannot wait to try and get that AAA rating that he lost when he was a cabin boy on the HMAS State Bank. I think the Premier was the chief engineer of the ship that they ran into and sank in the reef called South Australia. The cabin boy and the chief engineer lost the AAA rating, they sunk the bank and they sunk the state, and now they are very happy to get the rewards of the reduced debt.

Of course, there were crocodile tears because the Liberals sold ETSA. I am sure the Premier and the Treasurer would be delighted to still have ETSA on their books; they would be delighted to have the media and everybody in South Australia screaming at them about power prices in Paul Keating's deregulated national electricity market; screaming at them to do what Queensland and New South Wales have done to their detriment, that is, cross interchange revenues and expenditures from retail to power production, and run the business into the ground at the state taxpayers' expense. They would be delighted to have the \$10 billion worth of debt and all the problems that went with that. They would be delighted to still have a AA rating, not a AA plus rating.

I am sure that in their hearts the Premier and the Treasurer just wish every night before they go to bed and put their little heads on a pillow that they still owned those power assets. Maybe we were mistaken when a couple of the members opposite were wondering around the corridors as the sale debate was under way saying, 'Thank God you guys are doing this. We won't have to do it; you'll clear the debt, and sort out the mess we created. When we are in government we will be clear to run.' That is what was being said, I can assure members and that is exactly what has happened. We did what was best for the state and, gracefully, the state is now the beneficiary and so is this government.

Before you come in here and crow about what a good job you are doing, be honest with people about the circumstances you have inherited, and the reasons why the state economy is in such good shape. If you were genuine at all, if you had an ounce of integrity on the issue of power, if you really believed in your hearts that the sale of those assets was wrong—we do not believe that, we sold them. We believe that getting rid of the state debt created by the State Bank was a better thing to do. We believe that Paul Keating's market required us to make that decision. We made a tough decision. We do not believe it, but you say that you disagree with us. If you generally believed that for one moment when you were first elected you would have had the integrity and the courage to go to the people of South Australia and say, 'We will rectify the mistake the Liberals made. We will unscramble the egg; we will reacquire the assets; and we will get back into the power generation business.' But, of course, what do we hear? Silence. Have they done that? No. Of course, the assets have been on the market. I have pointed this out to the house before.

Members should read *The Advertiser* of 4 October 2003; members should read *The Financial Review* of 28 April 2004; and members should read *The Advertiser* editorial on 3 December 2004, which said to the government 'Well, if that's what you believe, power prices need to be hauled into line, and the state government should consider establishing its own electricity retailer.' Members should listen and read the transcripts from the radio talkback at that time, and listen to other public callers. If that is what you believe, why have you not had the integrity to unscramble the egg? We all know the reason: because the Treasurer wants to come in here and crow about what good shape the economy is in. It is another Labor lie.

They are delighted that the power assets have been sold; they are delighted that the debt has been reduced; and they are delighted that they can bash the Liberal Party and talk about bloodsucking power companies at their will, and refuse to take any of the money that they still have in the bank, or money that was used to remit debt, and reinvest it into getting power prices down. We have not delivered on our promise,

have we? 'If you want lower power prices elect Mike Rann and Kevin Foley.' Why have we not delivered on that? Because we do not want to take the money that was used to pay off state debt out of the bank and do something with it in the market to alleviate the problem. We just want to let it swell. You do not care less about the increase in power prices; you do not give a hoot. You are just going to ride this out until the pressure is great enough to force you to invest more than the paltry amount you have in concessions or other interventions to ease the burden on those most in need. Forget that lie; it is just an absolute load of hogwash. That is true of much of what the government has initiated.

In these good economic times that we enjoy, is the government making hay while the economic sun is shining? Is the government restructuring this economy? We have had Mitsubishi partially close. As media reports tell us, the outlook for Tonsley does not look bright. The string of companies that has left the state since Labor was elected is absolutely striking. There have been 20 to 30 leading companies and thousands of jobs leave the state. The list of companies coming in is extremely tiny. We are hands off the economy; the government does not want to be involved.

In my hand I have news clips which talk about Queenslanders and Western Australians coming here trying to take Mitsubishi workers from Lonsdale because their economies are booming and being reformed. They need skilled workers; we do not because, clearly, our economy is a little bit more stagnant than theirs. They are appealing to people saying, 'Get out of South Australia; come and work for us.' This economy that the Treasurer was crowing about earlier on today cannot seem to accommodate these highly skilled workers at Mitsubishi. The Western Australians and the Queenslanders have to come here and take some of our best and most talented people away off to the Far North Queensland and to the far north-west of Western Australia.

In some respects, South Australia's economy has stepped forward. Of course, exports have fallen back from over \$9 billion to \$7.2 billion; the Treasurer forgot to mention that today. Of course, the rate of jobs growth is much less than the other states; of course, tourism recovery here has been slower than everywhere else; and of course, in almost every economic indicator, our progress in the last 2½ years of economic sunshine has been slower than every other state.

Recently, before bedtime I was perusing—as I tend to do—economic reports. I commend to members the Neilson Media Research report entitled, 'Virgin money: spenders' report August 2004', reported in *The Financial Review*. It says that, because of buoyant housing prices and low interest rates, people are borrowing and spending. It talks about the fact that it is because of low interest rates and the property boom that jobs are buoyant and there is money splashing around in the economy. I ask the Treasurer: what will happen when it ends? Have we reformed the economy? I have perused the ABS figures on R&D investment. It is scary. This state is the worst performer of all in R&D expenditure, in socioeconomic outcomes, in almost every category. We are way behind every other state in R&D. So, we are not reinventing the state economy at all.

Not much has been done in 2½ years except 'steady as she goes'. The monkeys are in the car driving along the road, hoping she will not crash off into the trees. We have inherited a great show, and guess what: nothing has happened. Let us wait and see what happens when things are not so buoyant. If we do get a federal Labor government and it wrecks the economy (as they always do), we will see the government

under the pump. Thank you for crowing today, Treasurer: you did a great job. You were not responsible for any of it: we were. Good luck in the future.

**Mrs REDMOND (Heysen):** Like other members, I am pleased to rise in the Address in Reply and to acknowledge, first of all, the excellent work done by our Governor. As I speak to people in other states, everyone seems to be very well aware of who our Governor is and what a particularly good job she does. I want to place on the record my appreciation, on behalf of my constituents, of the excellent work that she does, and also that of Mr Bruno Kruminis, her deputy, who of course presented the address on behalf of the Governor on Tuesday.

As has been mentioned by a number of other people, the speech left a lot to be desired as far as having any real substance in it. I thought that perhaps the best way for me to approach it was to look at the issues for which I now have shadow responsibility and see what was happening in those areas. Of course, we are all aware that this government was dragged kicking and screaming into having to set up the inquiry into child sexual abuse. The Leader of the Opposition had been calling for it quite vigorously, and with a lot of substance in his claims, for almost two years. The government had even had its own report, the Layton report, since early last year. So, it had had that report for 18 months, yet it took all that time—and even then the government was extremely reluctant to take the view that it needed to set up the inquiry into child sexual abuse.

The Senate report, which was released a couple of weeks ago (which I have now finished reading), confirms much of what we have been saying to the government whilst we have been in opposition about what has been going on and the need to have the sort of inquiry that has at last been set up. It is just a shame that the timing of it is such that, even though we passed the legislation at the end of our session in July, we will not see the inquiry get under way until the end of this year, and it will possibly be 2005 before it starts to do anything.

The level of difficulty in terms of dealing with not just the issue of child sexual abuse but all the issues raised by the Layton report and the protection of children should concern us all. I have also read the workload analysis report, which was prepared by independent consultants who were engaged on the basis of the recommendation in the Layton report to look into the workload analysis of FAYS, as it was then called. However, the independent consultants came back a month or so after they were engaged at the end of last year and advised that the job they had been set simply could not be done because the problems within that department were so deep and systemic that it was simply an impossible task. They are deep and systemic, and we need to do a lot more than we currently are to address the problems.

The workload analysis report indicates that some 49½ per cent of the case workers in the department have been graduates for only two years; in fact, half of them—25 per cent—have been graduates for only a year. In addition, we have a burnout of experienced staff, and the result is that we have a dysfunctional department. They are under a lot of pressure to meet statutory requirements, and that creates problems with respect to both the burnout of the senior staff and also the younger staff, who are so newly graduated. In circumstances where they should be taught how to be social workers in the real world, they are instead finding that they are under enormous pressure because of statutory require-

ments. To meet those statutory requirements they then have to give priority to ensuring that inquiries are carried out. The workload analysis report makes it clear that this is a sort of spiralling problem.

I am disappointed at the way in which the government has addressed this matter, in that its solution seems to be simply to engage a lot more people. I know that in the address by the Deputy Governor there was mention of, I think, 186 new child protection workers. The difficulty is that, having the report on that workload analysis about how dysfunctional this department is and how the problems are so deep and systemic, it is not a solution to simply say, 'Let's get more case workers and throw them into that same unworkable, unusable system.' We need to address the system and how to make it work. Clearly, it is not working at the present time.

With respect to the area of disability services, I was profoundly disappointed in the government's lack of any statement in the Address in Reply. There is a mention on page 9 of hoping to build better communities. At the top of page 9 it states:

The government is aiming to improve the quality of life and wellbeing of all South Australians.

They seem to have left out one group, and that is those who suffer from profound disability.

I have indicated before in this house my view that this is going to be a generational issue. This is an issue that is about to hit us like a tidal wave, because about 50 years ago people stopped leaving their profoundly disabled children in institutions for their lifetime and, thankfully, began taking them home and raising them in their families. That has been a wonderful thing for the families, largely, but it is a lot of work for them. It has been a wonderful thing for the people born with those profound disabilities or who sometimes acquire them later in life, because they have such an improved quality of life in a home setting compared to what they would have had in an institution. However, we are now reaching the point where the people who began taking their children home are becoming elderly and frail and sometimes reaching the age at which they actually die, and those children are now middle aged.

I believe that it is unreasonable for us as a society to say to those people, 'Now you have to be institutionalised', because we have not actually got round to figuring out what we are going to do to address the issue of what we will do with these people and where we should put them. I can only take my hat off to the people who actually manage the parenting of a profoundly disabled child. I have constituents in my electorate who have young men of 19 and 20 years of age with the brain capacity and intellect of an 18-month old and who are still in nappies. I can only imagine how difficult it must be to deal with a child the age of my son and have to change their nappy and wield them like an 18-month old baby. I have people who have to get up every night up to 19 or 20 times because of their child, and yet they are expected to keep doing that.

My view is that we should be saying to those people, 'You've saved us a lot of money over the years by not taking the easy option and leaving your child in an institution but by taking this child home and raising it in a family setting.' Surely, of all the people in our community, these people deserve our support and assistance, having saved us all that money. But the case that has currently been getting a lot of publicity has been the Moving On program. That program, as we should all know, has been under-funded significantly.

Children who have disabilities and who have finished whatever schooling they are able to complete, once they have left schooling have to have something to go to. If their disability is such that they are never even going to manage to work in a sheltered workshop, what happens to them?

If we provide them with no options, no formal strategies for what they are to do with their time, then the children themselves lose such skills as they may have acquired during their schooling; they lose their socialisation; and they lack that contact with their peer group. The parents are drowned in the difficulty of how to manage this child seven days a week, 24 hours a day without break and often with very little respite time. Often, if they do get respite, not only is it very short but it is at considerable cost. It has been clear since the institution of the Moving On options that that program will need an increasing level of funding for many years to come. If youngsters come into it at the age of 19 or 20 when they finish their formal schooling and it is going to continue until, basically, they reach an age where they can no longer attend, we have to be looking at a 40-year program with increasing funding as the number of people needing that provision increases over the 40 years.

Every year I expect there will need to be an increase. At the current time, we are within reach of actually fixing the shortfall in the funding. Prior to the budget we were under-funding that program at \$3.2 million for the year. The government did put in extra money but only \$1.2 million. That left it \$2 million short, yet \$2 million is not even what this government is making extra per day in its windfall on property taxes because of the housing boom. It seems to me to be sensible to be saying, 'Let's get it right now' and recognise that this funding is going to have to increase. It will not only need to be indexed to accommodate those who are there as the prices increase for the provision of prices to them, but it will have to increase every year because more and more youngsters will be coming out of their schooling and into the system. But for many years to come very few, if any at all, will come out the other end and no longer need the provision of the service.

I implore the government to do something about that and not just use the rhetoric of wanting to improve the quality of life and wellbeing of all South Australians without giving a mention to these people who do so much for our society in looking after their children so well but who need our support in getting those areas of assistance. The area of homelessness does get a mention in the speech, in the middle of page 11, where it says:

My government believes that the Social Inclusion Initiative has achieved good results in dealing with homelessness.

That is it: that is the only time homelessness gets a mention. There is no actual mention of any initiatives to address homelessness. On the figures that I have been given we have several different layers of homelessness, most obvious being those who are sleeping rough, the actual hard core homeless. The latest figure I have been given is that we have about 800 of those people in this state who do not have a home at all to go to. This government prior to its election promised that it would halve the number of homeless. It did not actually declare whether it was halving the number of those homeless or of the overall homeless, whom I will talk about in a minute, but it promised to halve the number.

Even if we are dealing with only that 800, thus far, more than two years into the term, the government's initiatives have only introduced steps to take care of 10 per cent of

them—not half. Those initiatives are only announced thus far: they have not built the buildings yet and actually put the people in, so I will be very surprised if they get even 20 per cent of the actual homeless dealt with. Then we have the secondary homeless. The figures vary on that, but it is about 7 000 to 8 000. Those are people classified as having inadequate or inappropriate accommodation.

Far too many people are living in a small unit, people who are in squats, and an interesting term that I have come across since being appointed shadow minister is that of lounge surfers—the name given to people who turn up on the doorstep of a friend or relative and say, 'Look, I've got nowhere to stay. Can I stay here?' They stay for a few days, and people generally have to move them on, and they find somewhere else, and the term that has been coined around this country is lounge surfers. The government does not seem to be doing much at all to help them. In fact, on the figures from the Housing Trust, there has been a decline in the number of housing tenancy properties available and an increase in the waiting lists for obtaining public housing. There has been a lot of publicity about it recently.

The inadequacy of that accommodation is not helped by the third category, and this is not to do with homelessness but housing affordability in this state. By definition, housing affordability is based on whether or not you spend more than 30 per cent of your income to provide yourself with housing. I have no doubt that there are many people, young couples, young people, middle-aged people—all sorts of people—who pay more than 30 per cent on their mortgage. I do not know how good the definition is, but it is nevertheless the accepted definition of what constitutes housing affordability, and housing is no longer considered to be affordable once you are contributing more than 30 per cent of your income to provide a roof over your head.

The sad thing is that in South Australia, in particular around the metropolitan area, we have a fairly limited amount of land. We have areas to the north of the city, and areas to the south, and we have the hills to the east of the city, but there are fairly stringent controls on building on those because of hills face zone or water catchment or a range of other areas. So, there is a limited geographical area in which we are able to have housing developments, and there is also, according to the theorists, a limit to the size of a city, in terms of how far people are prepared to travel. Cities are thought to be, on one theory, about one hour wide. However, one hour wide for a person who travels by foot obviously makes a difference to one hour travelling by bus, compared to one hour travelling by car, so there is a mix. But, by and large, most people in Adelaide travel up to one hour, but not more than one hour, in each direction to travel to their work, etc.

What worries me most in this area is that, some years ago, we set up the Land Management Corporation, and its specific brief was to ensure the availability of affordable housing land for the population of this state, and it has had its key focus reversed. Its focus is now stated to be maximising returns to the government. So, rather than trying to provide land which is affordable, which lets young people get into the housing market, we are maximising returns to the government by releasing land in such a way that prices are maximised. That briefly covers the very small mention in the Deputy Governor's address to us on Tuesday of the areas for which I have any shadow responsibility.

There are a number of other things that I want to talk about that were mentioned in the Deputy Governor's speech, and they are a couple of local issues that affect my electorate.



The EPA has been given considerably more power according to this address. On page 15 of the speech it is stated:

It is intended that, among other things, it—

that is, the Environment Protection Amendment Bill—

will strengthen the power of the Environment Protection Authority and other administering agencies to look after the environment more efficiently.

I will be looking at that bill with a great deal of interest because the last thing that I want to do is increase the power of the Environment Protection Authority so far as it operates within my area. We have decisions, because of that agency, which are a nonsense. To give a couple of examples, there is a chicken farm in Mount George, and a main road dissects the chicken farm. On one side of the road there is a house and several chicken sheds and, on the other side of the road, the remainder of the chicken sheds. They hatch 580 000 chickens a year on this chicken farm. The owners decided that they would be prepared to close down the chicken farm and have it subject to all sorts of orders regarding removing the sheds, cleaning up the site, all the mess, and so on.

The only thing that they required was to sell the land on the other side of the main road, which was nine acres, as a single allotment. They did not mind if that single allotment was to have all sorts of stringent controls on it about what sort of house could be built, about where it could be built, and what the effluent disposal arrangements had to be—that was okay. One house on nine acres on the other side of the road and the EPA said ‘No.’ So, instead of having one house on nine acres, the EPA’s advice in protecting our environment was to continue to have 580 000 birds trucked in and out, with something like 120 semitrailer truck movements (or large truck movements) every time birds are delivered or moved, every time feed is delivered and removed, and every time the chicken manure fertiliser is removed after a batch of chickens.

Instead of having one house for one family on nine acres, our Environment Protection Authority says, ‘No. That would be a bad precedent. We can’t go down that road.’ That is just a nonsense. So, the idea that we are going to give more power to the EPA, which behaves so irresponsibly in terms of protecting our environment, is something that I cannot countenance, and I will be fighting against that measure.

To give another example, I have a chap who set up a business cleaning the outside of houses using just water—no chemicals. Before he set up the business he went to the council and the EPA and asked everybody what requirements there were and he did not have anything to comply with. He set up his business and made a huge investment and four years down the track, just when he is getting to the stage where the business is making a bit of money, the EPA stepped in and said, ‘But you can’t do that—that water is going into the stormwater.’ It is perfectly clean water, except for what is being washed off the outside of any house. But, he was told, ‘We cannot let that water go into the stormwater drain—that’s against the rules; we’re going to have to make you close down your business.’ I have numerous examples of the EPA behaving in that peculiar fashion, and I was very pleased to receive the minister’s statement yesterday about the finding on blocks up in the Hills, because many are in the electorate of Heysen. I agree that there are some blocks up there that cannot be built on. But, when you get to the stage where the EPA is telling people that they cannot build on it for stupid reasons, it is time to rethink the process.

We have to look at things like the significant trees legislation because, after all, a significant tree under our definition not only includes a tree with a circumference of more than a certain amount one metre above the ground, but it can even include a bunch of poplars coming out of the ground. If ever there was a pest plant it is poplars, but technically it can be classified as a significant tree and we can get a recommendation that the property cannot be built on for fear of pulling down some poplars because they are a significant tree. The member for Morphet mentioned to me that he has one example of a block that cannot be built on because next door there is a significant tree. We have to get a bit real. If we are to encourage this state to grow, we have to start looking at things realistically and realise that, if we are to have a state that is functioning and ticking along properly economically, then some things have to be allowed to occur, not least of which might be building a house on a house building block.

Another couple of things which have come up in my electorate and which did not get much of a mention in the speech include the Aldgate kindy and primary school. The Aldgate kindy sits just at the back of the shops at Aldgate and is not well located in terms of facility for the children, parking and a range of other things. The Aldgate school is up on a hill about a kilometre away and it has a spare room, so it was agreed between the two councils of the kindy and the school that it would be a good idea to relocate the kindy up to the school. It was recognised that there would need to be some special fencing and some special requirements, but the department has failed to come to any conclusion. It needed all sorts of feasibility studies about it first and, when it reached the end of that, it decided that it would cost something like \$380 000 to move. We are not moving the building but simply the kids and the little bit of equipment they have. The families of the kindy kids could pick up the equipment and move it over a weekend, but for a government department to say it will cost \$380 000, even with all the best fencing in the world, I cannot see a justification for the delays perpetrated by the department and for the cost it is insisting be incurred in relation to the relocation of one little kindergarten to one existing classroom within an existing school. All the school zones are already around it.

Another problem we have in my area has been a difficulty—and it has been in the media today—in relation to the 50 km/h zoning. I supported the introduction of 50 km/h zoning when introduced and I still support it for the streets for which it was intended. It was made quite clear during the debate when we introduced it that it was going to be 50 km/h in the back streets, and the arterial roads would remain at 60 km/h. Yet, there are numerous examples in my electorate of roads which are clearly arterial roads but which have been rezoned to 50 km/h. Whilst I have never been a proponent of the view that governments use road safety measures as revenue raisers, in the case of a number of roads around my electorate and roads such as South Terrace and Hutt Street, where there are no residences (residential areas were to be the 50 km/h zones and not arterial roads), it is clearly a revenue raising mechanism for the government, and no doubt it is very keen on getting more revenue.

I suggested to both the council and the minister that it might be appropriate to say, ‘Let’s look at it on this basis: if we say that an articulated bus has a regular route along a road, that is probably an indication that it is an arterial road and therefore should be zoned at 60 km/h.’ I believe most people who complain about being pinged are upset about the

fact that the government has it wrong, and I call on the government to have an appropriate look at what it has done in that area.

I will mention one other school in my area, namely, the Mylor Primary School, where there have been delays in getting a refurbishment. This school wanted a modest refurbishment and asked for \$1.4 million. Ultimately \$1.04 million was approved, so they were already short on funds, but they were told that it was because the multi-purpose room they had asked for was classified as a hall by the architects when they put the plans in, so that did not come under the same funding. Nevertheless, they adjusted to that and said that they still needed two double Atco classrooms with a wet area in between, and that would be sufficient to house the children, provided they could do up the existing wooden building.

I agree they needed new toilets, as they were away up the back yard and it is a cold and wet place in winter. The department then built the new toilets at a cost of \$200 000. This was not with a new septic system—that will be put in separately and an extra \$80 000 charged for that. It was \$200 000 for a new block of toilets. I am gobsmacked that that sort of money has to be spent. I could build a mansion for that sort of money. It does not make sense to me.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mrs REDMOND:** That's right. All the kids could have a lovely toilet in a private home for that sort of money. The \$200 000 was taken off the amount allocated for the school's refurbishment. The school is only asking for double Atco transportable classrooms that do not have asbestos in them sufficient to house its students. It also wants a covered walkway outside the rooms because, at the moment, there is just no way for them to move from one room to another in the winter without getting very wet. I often think that many of the departmental officers who deal with these issues just do not understand the Hills and the amount of water that falls there over the winter. All the school wants is for the children to be able to get to the toilet and the shelter under a covered way. It is very cold there in the winter and, if they could at least get to those two areas under a covered way, they would not find life quite as difficult as it can be at that time of year.

In my last minute, I want to congratulate the member for Unley on his long overdue comments about the gratuitous and 'sanctimonious lip service', as he called it, we pay to the Aborigines of this state at these openings and functions. I remember that when the Minister for Youth opened her estimates statement, she acknowledged she was on Kaurna land.

Time expired.

**The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Minister for Transport):** I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the house be extended beyond 5 p.m.

Motion carried.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms Bedford):** The member for Kavel.

**Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel):** Thank you for that very correct pronunciation of the electorate I have the honour of representing in this place, Madam Acting Speaker. With great pleasure, I join my colleagues in contributing to the motion to adopt the address of the Lieutenant-Governor, Mr Bruno Krumins, at the opening of this fourth session of the 50th parliament. With my parliamentary colleagues, I sat in the

chamber of the other place and listened intently to the speech of His Excellency, the Governor's Deputy, which outlined this government's questionable achievements and its plan for the future.

At the outset, I commend Her Excellency Marjorie Jackson-Nelson on the tremendous job she does in carrying out her vice-regal duties for this great state of ours and the tremendous job that the Lieutenant-Governor, Mr Bruno Krumins, does in his duties in supporting Her Excellency. It has been my pleasure to attend to a number of functions at Government House, particularly the Queen's Birthday function. I think in some years we have attended a Christmas party there, and that has been quite pleasurable.

I would like to refer to some of the content of His Excellency's speech, which obviously was scripted for him by government officers, ministers, and so on. When I read the speech again, I could relate quite a number of areas directly to my electorate of Kavel and, as I work through the speech, I will elaborate on some of those. On page 5 is a heading, Growing Prosperity. The first sentences state:

My government is committed to achieving sustained economic growth—with all South Australians sharing in the benefits through more and better job opportunities and accessible, high-quality services.

To this end, it will develop and implement a Statewide Workforce Development Strategy designed to bring about a more skilled workforce and efficient labour market.

I come from a banking background, and I was taught that, when such statements are made, they have to be backed up with facts and figures. In the context of the statement made by the government, if we look at the ABS labour force figures for July, they show that South Australia was the only state to suffer a full-time employment decline over the past 12 months. This state continues to miss out on the national jobs boom that is occurring as a consequence of the outstanding economic management of the federal Liberal government. I will read some figures from a table released by the ABS concerning the full-time job movements trends in July 2003 to July 2004 as a percentage: South Australia, minus 1.5 per cent; the Northern Territory, positive .6 per cent; New South Wales, positive 1.2 per cent; the ACT, positive 1.8 per cent; Western Australia, a 2.8 per cent improvement; Victoria, 3.9 per cent; Tasmania, 4.6 per cent; and Queensland, 6.2 per cent. All the others are getting better. Australia's average was a 2.9 per cent positive trend movement. As I said, this state is a negative 1.5 per cent.

Again, this government's spin on the economy has been designed to conceal the truth. A media release issued by the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education hailed the fact that total employment rose by 700 to 720 400 over the year. Unfortunately, what the government has not told the general community is that the 700 extra jobs were all part time (as pointed out by the very astute member for Hartley), and that full-time employment fell by a staggering 7 600.

All I can say about that is that if, in its wildest dreams, the government thinks that it will achieve what it is stating in this speech, it has a hell of a lot of work to do. What we have seen in the last 2½ years gives no indication that anything will improve, because, as the member for Waite pointed out quite correctly, the car is rocketing along the road with a bunch of monkeys in it and goodness knows where it will end up. I must admit that that was quite an amusing and accurate description of what will end up being quite a tragic result of

this government's mismanagement. The Governor's speech also states:

The strategy, along with a review of the traineeship and apprenticeship system, will seek to ensure South Australia's training system can provide for future skill needs. The government is working hard to address the high rate of youth unemployment.

Well, that is a very interesting statement, because I can give a first-hand description of an issue in my electorate that puts this statement to the test. The member for Hartley and I met with two vocational education training coordinators in my electorate. We spoke about a number of issues, but a very interesting issue was raised. The two coordinators have the use of a government vehicle and, through the entrepreneurial attitude of the board of the regional vocational education training program, they made the decision to buy two Holden Commodores. They were, I guess one could say, a sportier version of a base model, but they did that for a specific reason.

They did it so that the money they saved in their budget could be channelled back to provide additional training places for the youth in our community. They bought these Commodores because the resale value was very good and they could do it at a nil turnover cost. It is pretty clear what it means. It means that the cars are purchased at a discounted government rate, they drive them for two years or 40 000 kilometres (whatever the kilometres must be), they turn them over at that time and they can sell them for the same amount of money—or arguably more—than what they paid for them.

They have done that instead of going to DAIS, or whatever the department is with which they must deal, to purchase another vehicle, arguably with a poor resale value that will have a negative impact on their budget. They are being told that they cannot use a bit of initiative to save some money so that they can have additional funds to put back into the system for which they are employed, that is, to provide training for the youth in the community. When kids leave school they can undertake these vocational education training courses and have some qualifications, some certificates, behind them. They can secure employment easier than they would have if they had not undergone that training.

Here are some people using some initiative to save some money to provide for the real reason for their existence, but the bureaucracy (and the member for Stuart refers to it quite regularly), the Sir Humphreys, step in and say, 'No, you cannot use your initiative. Everything must be channelled through the government department, and that is that.' If the government thinks that it is working hard to address the high rate of youth unemployment, I suggest that the respective minister, whether it is the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education (Hon. Steph Key) or the Minister for Education—whoever it might be—go back to their department, to their CEOs, and start asking some hard questions.

We get the Treasurer, the Deputy Premier, in here ranting and raving about how fantastic the government is, how enterprising it is and the tremendous initiative it uses. Well, I can tell members that if that is the message the Deputy Premier is putting out it is certainly not filtering down through the respective departments.

We move on to page 6, where it states that under the State Strategic Plan the government aims to treble the value of our export income to \$25 billion a year by the year 2013. As my colleagues have previously stated, that is a pretty big ask in view of the situation in which we find ourselves. We see the employment figures trending in a negative way. Unfortunately for this state, we see the export figures trending in a

negative way. Under the previous Liberal government, our exports went from \$3 billion a year to \$9 billion a year. Unfortunately, that figure has now dropped back to \$7.2 billion a year. Again, this government has a mighty job facing it if it thinks it is going to turn that situation around to where we are going to realise \$25 billion in eight years, by the year 2013. Therefore, in eight years we have to reverse, turn around the *Queen Mary* and start heading in a direction whereby, they say, the state will see the export income reach \$25 billion a year.

*Mr Scalzi interjecting:*

**Mr GOLDSWORTHY:** My colleague makes a very pertinent point: that that will never be achieved if we have a federal Labor government, because it wants to take us all the way back to the seventies and eighties in terms of how we used to deal with our industrial relations. We want to turn the clock back. We also see this government trying to do that with the Fair Work Bill. This staggers me, in the year 2004, although I understand the reason for it. The Labor Party is beholden to the union movement. It tries to paint itself in a different manner, but the reality of the situation is that it is beholden to the union movement. That is why we see the Fair Work Bill introduced. It is a sop to the unions. I hope and pray that we do not see the day when we get a federal Labor government, because what the Minister for Industrial Relations is trying to do to this state we will see a federal Labor government do to the country. Quite honestly, we cannot afford to do that. I do not want my children growing up in an environment like we saw when Dunstan, Bannon, Hawke, Keating and Whitlam were in power. Arguably, this country has never been in a better economic situation than it is now under the stewardship of John Howard.

*Mr Caica interjecting:*

**Mr GOLDSWORTHY:** The member for Colton interjects. If he wants to get up—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Interjections are out of order.

**Mr GOLDSWORTHY:** I apologise, sir, but I just want to make this point: if the member for Colton feels so strongly about the comments I am making, he has every opportunity, when I sit down in 13 minutes, to stand up and make a contribution and tell us his side of the story. What have we seen in this debate? We have seen about three government members get up and speak in defence of where they are trying to take the state. Obviously, the member for Enfield had to speak because he was the mover; the Minister for Health had to speak because she was the seconder; but who else has spoken? The member for Wright, and nobody else.

**Mr Snelling:** We're saving our thunder.

**Mr GOLDSWORTHY:** The member for Playford has every opportunity to speak, as do the member for Torrens and the member for Colton. You can have your turn, but you won't!

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Kavel should come back to the substance of the bill.

**Mr GOLDSWORTHY:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker; I will continue. On page 7 of the Lieutenant-Governor's speech, with reference to mining, it is stated:

My government's \$15 million plan for accelerating exploration is helping to open up our vast mineral and petroleum resources to investors, and this is creating jobs in regional and remote South Australia.

What a joke! The member for MacKillop, the shadow minister for mining, has a very good and comprehensive understanding of this whole issue. Unfortunately, the

ministers in this government do not have a very clear, in-depth understanding of their portfolios. A constituent came to see me about a mining issue. He has a lease for a private mining operation. He wants to go to the Far North and mine for different varieties of marble. I have given this information to the member for MacKillop. It is a horrendous nightmare what people have to go through, the bureaucratic maze is incredible, but they have to try to negotiate it in order to get into those areas.

This is not a huge open cut mine. It is not like Leigh Creek where there was a massive hole in the ground. From what I understand, that is old mining technology. All my constituent wants to do is open up a small part of the face of this marble so that he can show it to some investors and his bankers. Then he can generate the funds he requires to crank up the operation, but this bureaucratic maze has not allowed him to do that. I have been able to establish a reasonable relationship with the Hon. Paul Holloway in the other place, and we have been able to progress this issue to the point where my constituent has been given a very limited permit to open up some of the resource to show his investors.

I congratulate the minister for his assistance. As I said, I have been able to establish a reasonable relationship with the minister. He seems to be quite a decent person to deal with when you discuss an issue with him on a one-to-one basis. However, the bureaucratic problems that my constituent had in getting to that point were amazing. So, for the government to make this statement that it will help to open up vast mineral and petroleum resources is a joke, because if that is what they want to do they will have to look at how the bureaucracy works and how negotiations are undertaken with all the people involved, including the stakeholders. If that does not happen, if things are not improved, that definitely will not be achieved.

Then there is a statement about the government recognising that tourism is a significant generator of jobs and economic growth, particularly in regional and rural communities. That is another area where I can give a prime example—a glaring example—of the ineptitude and the intransigence of the government to act on what is a real problem in my electorate. The beautiful, iconic tourism town of Hahndorf is situated on the southern boundary of Kavel. If I have spoken about this matter once in this place, I reckon I have spoken about it at least 20 times in the 2½ years that I have been here. We have a continuing and increasing problem with heavy vehicle transport in the main street of Hahndorf. There has been media coverage about the alleged advertising clutter in the main street and how measures have to be implemented to address that issue. I regard the District Council of Mount Barker as a very good council. It is very well represented by its Mayor and elected councillors, and it is generally very well administered by its staff. I read that it recently appointed a compliance officer to address the issue of advertising material in the main street of Hahndorf, because it is state heritage listed. So, local government is prepared to address the matter of advertising clutter, but the state government has failed to address the vehicular clutter in the main street.

The Minister for Transport is here, which is fortuitous, I guess. We know how the previous minister for transport operated. He obviously operated pretty poorly, because he was sacked from that portfolio and a new minister was given that portfolio responsibility. It reached a point where I thought, 'How will I address this issue? The transport minister is obviously not paying any attention.' So, I invited the Minister for Tourism to lunch with us, and she graciously

accepted. Not long after that, I noticed that cameras were erected in the main street. Obviously, video surveillance and so on was carried out and Transport SA officials have received that information. But, to the tourism minister's credit, from her department she funded the amount of \$10 000 to the council to look at a master plan for the main street.

But what have we heard from Transport SA coming out of that survey with those cameras? Not a thing—not one email; not one letter from the transport minister. I do not even think the community association, which was represented at that lunch with the tourism minister, has heard anything. I am afraid that what we are seeing in the way in which the current minister presides over her portfolio responsibilities is no different from that of the previous minister. It was interesting to read a document from the Commercial Vehicle Industry Association, which talks about meetings with Transport SA. The document states:

SA has a new Minister for Transport (Trish White) following a ministerial reshuffle and from all reports she has a more positive can do/will do attitude than the previous minister, to the extent that TSA staff are 'flat out catching up on a backlog of work and cannot meet with industry groups before July'.

Obviously, this is a couple of months old. What does that say? It says that the previous minister—no wonder the Premier sacked him—was absolutely hopeless. This is an obvious reflection on the total ineptitude of the previous minister. Obviously, nothing has changed. In relation to his current portfolio responsibility for sport and recreation, I wrote a letter to him about an issue that the Mount Barker and District Rifle Club has. This issue relates to something that the rifle club raised with him in 2003. I wrote to the minister on 21 April this year about the issue. I got due advice that the Minister for Administrative Services acknowledged receipt of the letter and would follow up the inquiry. I was advised that I would receive a response shortly. That was dated 5 May. It is now 16 September—four months down the track—and we have not got a response. This issue was raised with the minister by that club in 2003, if I am correct.

Time expired.

**Mr HANNA (Mitchell):** I am responding to the address to parliament given on behalf of Her Excellency the Governor (Marjorie Jackson-Nelson). I want to focus on the comments made on her behalf, and obviously prepared by the Premier's office, in relation to South Australia's Aboriginal population. It has been stated that the government's intention is to improve the wellbeing of South Australia's Aboriginal population and that the government will consider new measures for Aboriginal consultation, engagement and representation, based on its understanding that decision making and priority setting must fully involve Aboriginal people. It has also been stated that, in regard to conditions on the previously mentioned APY lands, the government's work in this region will greatly benefit from the advice of two recently appointed advisers, Professor Lowitja O'Donoghue and Reverend Tim Costello.

I will focus on what the government has claimed it will do and what it has done in relation to the APY lands. It is interesting that the government is promising new measures for Aboriginal consultation, engagement and representation when one of the most appalling aspects of this government's behaviour this year has been the contempt with which it has dealt with the APY executive, that is, the elected leadership of people on the APY lands.

Earlier this year there was some media interest in the issue of petrol sniffing on the APY lands in the north-west of South Australia. Of course, there had been a long history of lack of resources and lack of on-site professionals to address the issues of petrol sniffing and other chronic problems, such as domestic violence and other types of crime. There had been a lack of political will on behalf of both Labor and Liberal governments over the last 20 years in respect of these problems. It was not as if government did not know about the problems, however. A report delivered by the Coroner in September 2002 spelled out the problems that the Anangu, the Aboriginal people, are experiencing in the lands, particularly in relation to petrol sniffing and drug abuse.

The Coroner suggested that federal and state governments 'should accelerate their efforts to find solutions to these issues and get beyond the information gathering phase forthwith'. I suggest that the state government failed to act on this advice until the *Advertiser* made headlines of the petrol sniffing issue on 15 March this year. As I have previously stated, I was very disappointed to hear the government's response to the freshly raised issue of petrol sniffing in March this year. The Rann government responded by announcing some sort of a takeover of the APY lands. Of course, without legislation this was not quite possible, but it made for a good media story. On 16 March in the *Advertiser*, the Deputy Premier (Hon. Kevin Foley) was reported to have said:

This government has lost confidence in the ability of the executive of the AP lands to appropriately govern their lands. . . this government has said we will not tolerate an executive that cannot deliver civil order, community services, social justice and quality of life to their community.

The extraordinary thing about those remarks is that the AP executive of course is not responsible for delivering civil order, community services, social justice and quality of life to that community. Who is responsible? The state government is responsible for delivery of such services through adequate policing, health care and so on. Of course, there is commonwealth funding, and that is also a critical issue, but it is a bit rich for the state government to pour scorn on the local Aboriginal leadership for not doing a job for which in fact the state government had responsibility. The other comment made by the Deputy Premier as reported at that time was:

I think this is an acknowledgment that the way we have administered Aboriginal land rights in this state has failed.

When I asked Premier Rann in parliament during question time if he endorsed the statements made by the Deputy Premier, the Premier refused to answer. Perhaps it has been recognised at the highest levels of government that those comments were in fact inappropriate. The people of the APY lands do need our support, but they also need self determination, and this is the guiding principle that guides the consideration of the Greens in relation to the troubles on the lands. But talk of taking control of the lands is patronising. It is the sort of colonial attitude that I thought we had left behind through the leadership of Don Dunstan and the Labor Party in the 1970s.

It seems that that attitude is still current in the government of the day; regrettably, even in the leadership of today's government. Leaving aside the media, the official response of the government was to put forward two pieces of legislation to allegedly solve the problems on the lands. One bill was in relation to the APY Executive to force elections on the lands as soon as possible. There was talk of a deal in parliament which would at least give the local community

several months grace to allow them to appropriately organise an election on the lands; however, the government did not hesitate in putting the legislation into effect, forcing the election at the earliest opportunity—so quickly that I query whether the Electoral Commissioner could adequately make the necessary arrangements.

The other piece of legislation that the government put forward earlier this year to solve the problems raised by *The Advertiser* in its petrol sniffing headlines was to directly deal with the issue of substance abuse and give police more power in relation to petrol sniffers in respect of offences, confiscation, and so on. It is interesting to reflect on the priorities of the government in relation to the APY lands, when one considers that the election legislation was rushed through but the increased police powers legislation has stalled. It lapsed at the end of the parliamentary session at the end of July and it is still to be debated in parliament. Presumably, the police who asked for more powers to deal with this critical issue are left struggling and must let crime walk in front of their eyes.

I mean that literally because I have been up on the lands in the context of my work with the Aboriginal Lands Committee and I have seen petrol sniffers with a billy can half full of petrol hung around their neck walk past the local primary school—a role model for the children playing in the school yard. Local authorities appear to be able to do nothing—elders are treated with contempt and police are treated with contempt because it may be several hours by the time they arrive at a local community after being called out due to the distances involved. It is, therefore, extremely difficult to apprehend offenders, even if the community had confidence that it would occur.

These delayed police response times are not just a problem in relation to petrol sniffing, they are even a problem in relation to crimes of domestic violence. I have been told of instances where offenders have not been found for perhaps a month after an occurrence of serious domestic violence resulting in grievous bodily harm. In those cases the time delay obviously makes investigation all the more difficult. We need to have police stationed on the lands and we need them to be available in the evenings and in the middle of the night, particularly. There has been some progress in the last few months—and in the area of policing, in particular, I note that police are now stationed more often on the lands themselves—but an anecdote relayed to me recently highlights the continuing problems. A woman who was the victim of a serious crime in relation to her home called police at Marla after normal business hours (Marla is recognised as the nearest permanently staffed station).

A message diverted the call to Port Augusta, many hours' drive to the south. From Port Augusta police were directed to attend from Umuwa. When police attended from Umuwa, which was not too far from the scene of the crime, the victim suggested that it would have been much more appropriate to be able to call Umuwa directly, but the system is not set up to allow that to happen, and the police work in shifts where they still maintain the strongest presence during the day in business hours. I suggest that most of the problems probably occur in the evening going into the early hours of the morning—at least in relation to petrol sniffers and those who abuse other substances.

I have dealt with the issue of petrol sniffing, but it has undue prominence in the media in respect of the problems on the lands. Housing is a critical issue. If you divide the population of the lands by the number of houses you find that there are probably somewhere between seven and ten people

per three bedroom house, depending on the transient population. You therefore have the inevitable tensions that arise from two or three generations, and perhaps different branches of the family, sharing the one three bedroom house. Compounding the problem is the lack of facilities for young people to do anything constructive other than watch television, and I would not call that educational either.

There are some moves in some parts of the lands to have community halls where activities are organised for young people, but nowhere near enough. In relation to health, there are functioning clinics, and probably every one of the workers in those clinics deserves a medal for the pressure that they work under and the frequent crises that they must face, but there is not enough funding for adequate health services on the lands. There is a point where the issues of health, housing and policing cross over, and that is in respect of the facilities available for professionals who go up to work on the lands. If they do not have dedicated housing for police, health workers, etc., then you have workers who either have to live off the lands and travel to the lands to do their work, or you have professionals who need to share with one or two others. Sometimes that might work out, but quite often that is not going to be appropriate to provide a reasonable standard of living for professionals who work there.

The same applies also to those who work in the art galleries on the lands. These are fantastic potential sources of revenue for local people, particularly based on the painting and other artwork of local women, and yet the growth of those facilities and the economic value of them is limited by staff, because usually inadequate housing is provided for those who would work in and promote those facilities. It is obviously not the function of the Aboriginal Housing Authority to supply housing to professionals who work on the lands, and one can readily see that it is a problem that goes across various government portfolios.

The government has set up a task force to deal with the problem, but it is simply not clear what progress it is making. I look forward to a report from the task force, or even perhaps the Premier himself, to the Aboriginal lands committee so that the work of the task force will be more transparent. Originally, when the talk of a takeover was in the media, the government appointed Mr Bob Collins as coordinator on the lands. That title was invented for the purpose and, according to the *Government Gazette*, Mr Collins was proclaimed coordinator of services on the lands. Following an unfortunate accident, Mr Collins is clearly unable to pursue his duties as coordinator.

I was pleased to hear that the government recently appointed Professor Lowitja O'Donohue and Reverend Tim Costello, but to what positions exactly I am not sure. They have been referred to publicly as 'advisers'. I do not know whether they are going to be proclaimed in any official fashion, and I do not know what formal power they are going to have. I know that they are sincere people, and they will take up the cause of local Aboriginal people passionately. How they are going to influence the provision of services and the cooperation of officials in government departments, both at a senior and at an operational level, I do not know. These are questions which need to be teased out if the reality is going to match the rhetoric.

In conclusion, I am pleased if the government is considering new measures for Aboriginal consultation, engagement and representation. Those measures are going to have to be better than the government has exhibited so far this year.

**Mr SCALZI (Hartley):** I, too, rise to support the Address in Reply. I acknowledge His Excellency, the Lieutenant-Governor—

*The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The Attorney-General is out of his seat and out of order with his interjection.

**Mr SCALZI:**—Mr Bruno Krumins, and commend him for his speech on behalf of the Governor, Mrs Marjorie Jackson-Nelson. As other members have mentioned, we have an excellent Governor in Her Excellency, Mrs Marjorie Jackson-Nelson and, indeed, we also have an excellent deputy. As I have mentioned previously, it is good to see a migrant, Mr Bruno Krumins, who is of Latvian background, hold such a high office. I think it adds credence to our multicultural society.

I also acknowledge reference to Kaurna land, which has already been mentioned. We do indeed have an indigenous history, and South Australia, on its proclamation on 28 December 1836, acknowledged that it was not terra nullius, and Governor Hindmarsh referred to the indigenous population. We know, too, that the Kaurna are the custodians of the Adelaide plains. Their view of the land is very different from the traditional European concept. Indeed, as Europeans, we think we own the land; indigenous Australians know that the land owns them. If we adopted that concept and viewed the land in the same ways as indigenous Australians, perhaps we would have more respect for it.

I wish to relate this Labor government to the election that is to be held on 9 October. Indeed, the three-year term of the federal government would finish in November. If South Australia still had a three-year term, the term of this government would finish in February. This government has had three budgets and has been scrutinised by three Estimates Committees and, if we put it in that perspective, we see that many of the promises this government made on health, education, law and order—

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** Law and order: full delivery.

**Mr SCALZI:** The Attorney says, 'Law and order': one could say 'a fool's delivery'. If you go out there you find uncertainty and people do not feel safe, despite the many measures, and it is sad to see that many of the crime prevention measures in place previously were not financed when this government came to office.

In June the Rann government handed down its third budget. It was scrutinised in the estimates and I was privileged for the first time to participate in those estimates as a shadow parliamentary secretary in further education, training and youth. In those areas there is still much to be desired. Whilst there have been some welcome announcements in child protection—and I commend the government for the resources it has put into that area, especially with the provision of councillors and training for state schools—I am disappointed that this has not been carried through for the independent schools. I understand and accept that the private sector has to find funds for its own staff but, if we are to look comprehensively at child protection, surely 30 per cent of our population in the private sector should have been provided with training programs for that child protection regime.

There have been much needed funds for health, but the government is still failing to meet the demands of an ageing population, with especially serious concern in the mental health system. The great failures were outlined well by the member for Enfield. Like the member for Enfield, I acknowledge that the problems with mental health have not occurred overnight and that the responsibility lies with governments

of all persuasion. However, this government came to power promising to deal with those problems. After two and a half years this government has failed to have an impact on those problems. Whilst the problems of deinstitutionalisation may be great in theory, and if supported in the community with adequate resources they might work, the reality is that, in many cases, rather than supporting individual rights as the member for Enfield has said, it has diminished people's rights to proper care and to having their needs addressed. They should have the right to access proper treatment and not the right to have treatment alone in the community.

If we are to compare this government with the previous eight years, as members often do whenever there is a problem, we will say, 'What have you done in the past?', but one should look at that in its proper context. The previous government, of which I am proud to have been a member, had a little and did a lot with that little. This government has had a lot of resources and has done a little and is delivering little in comparison to the resources it has. When we were in government there were no GST resources and no windfall in stamp duty and property taxes, and we had to deal with the serious economic problems with which we were faced. This government is losing the opportunity to deal with the serious social and educational problems that it has. I admit that it is not alone in that, but it has the resources to deal with it and is failing to do so. That is a serious concern for the future because it will be seen as a missed opportunity.

At a time when the government has had record windfalls through land tax and property-based taxes and millions are flowing into the Treasury, the government has been more obsessed with AAA ratings than with committing resources to education, hospitals, mental health and rehabilitation. It talks about being tough on law and order but, without adequate support for those who are in our prison system by way of rehabilitation and dealing with their problems of literacy and health, we will not deal with law and order. We will just perpetuate those problems because, when they come out of gaol, people will reoffend because they have not been properly rehabilitated.

By contrast, this government is spending on itself. We could refer to the Premier as the '\$6 million man' because, on coming to office, funds had to be put aside for the constitutional convention (and mention has been made in the press that that came to nothing), so let us say there was \$2 million for that; there was \$2 million for a new ministry for the member for Mount Gambier; and there was \$2 million for the member for Chaffey. The Premier is, indeed, the \$6 million man. He is finding funds to maintain himself in government at the expense of that windfall—that economic opportunity to deal with the real problems of health, the long waiting list for an ageing population and so on.

I welcome the inquiry into sexual abuse of state wards but, again, as many of my colleagues have said, this government has been dragged into having that inquiry. I am sure that Justice Ted Mullighan, an eminent South Australian, will do a great job and I look forward to the report. The government was forced into the inquiry but, until it was compelled to do so by the work of the Hon. Andrew Evans, it did not even lift the 1982 obstacle to prosecutions of people who had committed sexual abuse.

The Premier was quick to criticise the Anglican Church and the Catholic Church but was very slow to deal with the government's own backyard. But now we need the government and the parliament to ensure that this area is being dealt with, and I look forward to considering this issue. However,

if we are to deal with this serious issue properly in the medium to long term, we must put preventative measures in place to ensure that it does not happen again. We must have sexual abuse prevention strategies, and they must be canvassed properly. Research must be undertaken to ensure that people who have suffered so much over the years will not have to suffer in the future; if we do not, we fail future generations. It is no good using blame, because, at the end of the day, without proper measures in place, it will not produce the community wellbeing and the self-esteem required for people to grow fully as human beings in a safe and free society.

Let us look at what has happened federally. The federal government has created 1.3 million new jobs, kept interest rates low and stable by delivering seven budget surpluses, repaid \$70 billion from previous governments' debts, and Australian workers have seen real wages increase by 14 per cent—the economic strength that has been the basis of Australia's performing so well amongst OECD countries. However, one has to say that there have been lost opportunities in South Australia, especially in the last 2½ years. The community is hurting, but not from federal policies: it is hurting from an increase in public transport charges of 3 per cent; from an increase in motor vehicle registration of 3.7 per cent; from third party insurance premiums, up 5.5 per cent; from water charges, up 4.4 per cent; and from water rates, up 4.8 per cent. These increases compare with an expected inflation rate of 2 per cent.

So, in a time of national economic prosperity, with a low unemployment rate and the lowest interest rates in 30 years, the South Australian government is failing us because it is not delivering. Full-time job movement trends in July 2003-04 are, as follows: Northern Territory, 0.6 per cent; New South Wales, 1.2 per cent; ACT, 1.8 per cent; Western Australia, 2.8 per cent; Australia, 2.9 per cent; Victoria, 3.9 per cent; Tasmania, 4.6 per cent; and Queensland, 6.2 per cent. These are all Labor governments, and they are in tune with the federal prosperity and its economic basis. What is the trend in South Australia? It is minus 1.5 per cent.

Who can you blame? One has to ask why this Labor government is not delivering in the same way as the other Labor governments in other states. It is of great concern. Yesterday, Greg Kelton's article in *The Advertiser*, entitled 'Firms hunt for skilled workers', stated:

A major shortage of skilled workers is forcing South Australian companies to look overseas, while skilled workers already employed here are about to be poached by other states.

This is a serious concern. There is a shortage of workers in the area of energy and the trades and, whilst the government tells us that we have to be flexible and that we have to increase the school leaving age to 16, and we welcome that, there is talk of raising it to 17. However, unless we have proper strategies to deliver appropriate and flexible programs for these young people, we are not going to address the shortages in industry nor are we going to create educational opportunity for our young people.

I agree with the shadow minister for education, the member for Bragg, who says that South Australia has a skills shortage in such areas as IT, engineering, hairdressing, and all the trades. What has the Rann government done? One of the promises of the federal Labor Party is no TAFE fees for secondary school students. As the member for Kavel has rightly stated in his Address in Reply, there are difficulties where we are wasting funds in those areas—in the VET

programs, for example—where we can create more places. Look at the fees. We have a cap of \$1 200.

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General):** I move:

That the sitting of the house be extended beyond 6 p.m.

Motion carried.

**Mr SCALZI:** I support the shadow minister for education in her comments in the paper yesterday that the Rann government had promised to cut TAFE fees but the cap on fees in South Australia is now \$1 200 a year compared with only \$690 a year in New South Wales. If we accept that it is the responsibility of the government to provide adequate and flexible programs for our young people, for the 15 to 16-year olds and, in the future, the 17-year olds, it is unfair to expect parents to foot the bill. I know that parents are paying hundreds of dollars to meet some of the costs of the VET programs in schools today.

We must be flexible enough also to accept private providers who can provide worthwhile programs. TAFE provides further education for 80 per cent of young people, apart from the universities, but 20 per cent—hundreds of young people—are trained and educated by private providers. If we had a meaningful look at this area, we would find that we must support those private providers as well as the excellent work done by TAFE, because we must get away from the us and them mentality and find programs that work for young people. I believe that we should have a program that can look at young people and find meaningful ways to give them educational and work opportunities that have not been provided in the past.

In that way they would also meet the shortages in the trades that we are experiencing now. This is a government of broken promises. Although low, the unemployment rate compared with other states is high and, as I have said, the other Labor governments throughout Australia are doing better than this government in terms of addressing school shortages and finding meaningful employment for young people. We still have a 29 per cent youth unemployment rate. If we do not address those needs this figure will only increase in the future as a result of the increase in the school leaving age to 16.

We will fail these young people if we do not have appropriate VET programs in the schools to make sure that young people are able to have access to all the programs. I must commend the Minister for Education and the Director-General who, on 7 September, held an information evening at Glenunga International High School. That function was well attended by parents, teachers and business people. There is still a concern about mental health problems in schools. If

25 per cent of the general population has these problems, the schools have it as well.

Young people at that meeting said that we are still not addressing their needs in the schools. As I said, I commend these public forums, but we must apply the resources to ensure that VET programs are properly coordinated. We must make sure that parents can afford these programs. We must make sure that the schools can afford them and that the cost of these programs will not come out of their general budgets because, if that is the case, it will disadvantage other students as well as those students who require those programs.

The member for West Torrens today mentioned pamphlets issued by federal members. I would like to refer to some of the pamphlets issued by Senator Buckland, which are entitled, 'Senator Geoff Buckland, Labor Senator for South Australia'. In the future, perhaps we should look at the whole concept of what senators should be. They are not Labor or Liberal senators, they are state senators. I believe that is how we should view them, and that, first and foremost, the senators should act on behalf of their state.

I am the member for Hartley and I am a Liberal member, but, first and foremost, I am the state member for Hartley, representing the constituency of Hartley. Rather than just attack, as the member for West Torrens has done today, perhaps he should look at the letter that Senator Geoff Buckland sent out promoting the federal Labor candidate in Adelaide before attacking the federal member for Adelaide, who is serving her constituency.

In conclusion, I believe that, after 2½ years of what is a four year term, this government, which made health, education, law and order a priority, has failed to deliver on those promises. It has failed, even though it has the enormous revenue from the GST, the land tax windfall, stamp duty and all the revenue it collects from traffic fines as a result of the confusion between the 40, 50 and 60 km/h zones. As many members have outlined today, that confusion is causing problems and it needs to be addressed. As pointed out today, this is a Premier who is more interested in headlines. And we have to give him credit, he is doing very well in the media—after all, he is a journalist! However, in these difficult times, when we need properly to assess what is required in health, education, law and order and crime prevention programs, we do not need a journalist—we need a statesman.

**Dr McFETRIDGE** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 6.07 p.m. the house adjourned until Monday 20 September at 2 p.m.